A

LETTER

To the Reverend

JOSIAH TUCKER, D. D.

DEAN of GLOCESTER,

In ANSWER to

His Humble Addreſs and Earneſt Appeal, &c.

WITH A

POSTSCRIPT,

IN WHICH

The preſent WAR againſt AMERICA

Is ſhewn to be

THE EFFECT,

Not of the CAUSES aſſigned by Him and Others,

BUT OF A FIXED

PLAN of ADMINISTRATION,

FOUNDED in SYSTEM:

The LANDED oppoſed to the COMMERCIAL INTEREST of the STATE,

Being as the MEANS in order to the END.

By SAMUEL ESTWICK, LL.D. Aſſiſtant Agent for the Iſland of Barbadoes.

Vi aut Fraude fit Injuria. Cic. Off. lib. i. § 13.

LONDON:

Printed for J. ALMON, oppoſite Burlington Houſe, Piccadilly.

M.DCC.LXXVI.

A

LETTER, &c.

Reverend Sir,

HAVING had at three different times, three different opinions, concerning you and your project, for "a ſeparation of the colo-"nies in North America from Great Britain," I ſhall in this letter, with your leave (or without it) take the liberty to tell you what theſe opinions are; and having ſo done, reſting on my laſt opinion, your "humble addreſs, and "earneſt appeal, &c. &c." will become the object of my anſwer.

My firſt opinion, in language more expreſſive than my own, was;

That, "*Actio non mala, cum intentio ſit* "*bona.*

My ſecond,

That, Your politics were bad, but your policy was good.

My third,

That, Your end is wicked, and your means are worſe.

Now, however great my aſtoniſhment was, at this ſerious avowal of ſuch a barefaced ſoleciſm in politics, if I might uſe the expreſſion; yet having not then read what you had publiſhed on the ſubject, I was willing, not only to allow you what other projectors are commonly entitled to, "*the merit of a good* "*intention*," but I became, in ſome degree, your advocate alſo. I conſidered, that as ſoleciſms in language were ſometimes pardonable, for "*Impetratum eſt á ratione, ut peccare* "ſuavitatis *cauſâ liceret*;" ſo ſoleciſms in politics, for ſimilar reaſons, might claim the ſame indulgence. With this conſideration then, and becauſe I well knew that nothing could at that time, I will not ſay at this, be ſo big with horror to the children colonies in America, as a diſinheriſon from their parent-ſtate, I inferred, that you, aware of theſe feelings in them, had thus rung the alarm-bell of ſeparation, but to reſolve its diſcordant ſounds, through the medium of their fears, into meaſures of more perfect harmony. This, I perſuaded myſelf to think, might have been the object of your intention; and if ſo, like the "*ſuavitatis cauſâ*," it had juſtified the "*pec-* "*care liceret.*"

Upon this ground then was this my firſt opinion formed; and upon this ground it was my deſign to have left it: but being called

upon, in a letter from a friend of mine, for the communication of my ſentiments to him on the ſubject of your "*modeſt propoſal*," as he termed it, I returned him the following anſwer; which I here give you the exact copy of, as being explanatory both of the reaſons for, and the occaſion of, my ſecond opinion.

Dear Sir,

When I received the favour of your letter, requiring my thoughts on the dean of Gloceſter's *modeſt propoſal*, as you *modeſtly* called it, I had not then read his political tracts; which will be now an apology to you for the delay of my anſwer. I have ſince read them, and find that I might have ſaved myſelf the trouble of doing ſo: for when long ſtrings of arguments are produced, and, after being twiſted together, are made to end concluſively in a ſingle propoſition ſelf-evidently abſurd, what arguments more are neceſſary for deciſion than the propoſition itſelf contains? To appeal, in ſuch a caſe, to arguments, is like calling for evidence in court after the priſoner has pleaded guilty at the bar. Even ſo it is here: for after being

"About it, and about it,
"And about this ſame ſong;
"And, good gods! and about it,
"For I know not how long,"

The whole burthen of the ſong is; that, "a "ſeparation from the colonies in North Ame- "rica is for the intereſt and advantage of "Great Britain."

Now

Now to reaſon upon this propoſition is to be offenſive to your underſtanding; for who is it that, comprehending the terms of it only, can need any other *data* than the terms themſelves, to form an opinion upon it? Beſides, it is making that to be ſerious, which is in itſelf truly ridiculous.

What, therefore, remains to be done?--Monſieur Paſcal ſays, "*Qu'on peut refuter par des "railleries les erreurs ridicules*;" and Lord Shafteſbury aſſerts, that "Ridicule is the teſt "of truth." This ſubject may, perhaps, prove the truth of this teſt. Let me then call upon you, in my turn, to try this Dean and his doctrine by this fire-ordeal. I am myſelf unequal to the taſk. It is Attic-ſalt, ſuch only as yours is, that can kindle ſuch a flame. You know I am no ſtranger to your talents in this way: the dreſſing you have but now given to "Weſley's calm Addreſs," and for the ſight of which my thanks are due, ſufficiently proves to me, that to attempt with you is to ſucceed; and, therefore, as I ſhall expect my gratification herein, ſo I can conceive no ſpectacle ſo ridiculous, as that of this politician-divine, with his political tracts, inſtead of burning-irons, in his hands, trudging upon, and ſweating over, the red-hot plowſhares of your wit.

Whilſt you are thus engaged, it may not be amiſs that you take ſome notice too of your old acquaintance, "Marmor Norfolcience," *alias*, Doctor Dictionary Johnſon; who, for

the

the ſame offence, merits the ſame diſcipline. This *Britiſh lion* that was, but who is now changed into a *Hanover white-horſe*, has lately publiſhed a pamphlet, as no doubt you have heard, entitled, "Taxation no Tyranny;" in which, by the bye, and as two of a trade can never agree, he is ridiculouſly merry on the Dean's ridiculous propoſal, as he calls it. He ſays, "The Dean of Gloceſter has propoſed, "and ſeems to propoſe it ſeriouſly, that we "ſhould at once releaſe our claims, declare "the Americans maſters of themſelves, and "whiſtle them down the wind." And in in another place he adds, "One ridiculous "propoſal is beſt anſwered by another." But who could have thought that the compiler of a dictionary, whoſe object was definition, tho', it is true, his end very far from it, would ever gravely have coupled two terms ſo equivocally together? "Taxation no Tyranny," quoth the lexicographer. Now if, on the one hand, he means, that legal or conſtitutional taxation is no tyranny; *à la bonne heure:* agreed; for who can deny it? And why, therefore, is the public to be *bored* (to give you a *bon ton* term) with arguments, proving that, of which every individual is already convinced? On the other hand, if he means that illegal or unconſtitutional taxation, ſuch as the levying of ſhip-money, which brought a Stuart's head to the block, or raiſing the 4½ *per cent* duty on the Weſt-India iſlands by proclamation, as has been attempted, or by act of parliament, as may be attempted, is no tyranny; of ſuch arguments

ments as theſe what common-ſenſe could bear the inſult? Thus, you perceive, the very *title-page* of the doctor, like the *modeſt propoſal* of the Dean, not only condemns and executes itſelf, but plainly foretells, that there is not a page in his phamplet which deſerves to be read. Leaving then the doctor in your hands, I return to the Dean, as yet in my own. And here I muſt obſerve, that whatever abſurdity may attend this paradoxical propoſition of his, I do not therefore mean to fix the charge of ignorance upon him: on the contrary, I am of opinion, that he has proved himſelf, to ſpeak after the manner of Sir William Temple, *very ingeniouſly politic*, by ſhewing that *bad politics may be the reſult of good policy*; the *former* ſerving but as a foil to ſet off the luſtre of the *latter*.

It was with this clew that I was enabled to trace him in the traces of his ſeveral tracts; and which otherwiſe had proved untraceable labyrinths to me: for until I ſaw him through this medium of policy, like Proteus, he ſeemed a foreteller of events, and like Proteus, differing in appearance to others from myſelf. At one time indeed, as Swift ſays, of ſuch another enthuſiaſt, "I verily thought him "poſſeſſed;" and although not with the devil, with the belief that he was transformed, by reaſon of his prieſthood, and becauſe his name was Joſiah, into Joſhua, the choſen of God. This Joſhua, as it is ſaid, you know, made the ſun and the moon to ſtand ſtill in the

the natural world for a day and a night, without any *derangement* in nature, or other inconvenience, than merely that of puzzling Julius Cæsar, when he reformed the Roman calendar, to account for this ſtagnation of time. Now Joſiah, it would ſeem, in the political world, meant to do the ſame: for a ſtoppage at the bank, and a check upon commerce, were the obvious effects of his plan; and here the bank is the ſun, and commerce the moon that receives its exiſting light from that ſun. There was this difference indeed, that the chancellor of the exchequer would find it more puzzling to balance his caſh-book in this caſe, than Julius Cæsar did to ſettle his account of time in the other.

But now attributing to natural ſagacity, what before I had imputed to ſupernatural agency, I muſt do the Dean the juſtice to ſay, that no man ſeems to underſtand the policy of abſurdity better than himſelf. By policy, you will of courſe ſuppoſe me to mean, not that efficient of all wiſdom, which true policy is; but that Machiavelian policy, that ape of wiſdom, called ſtate-craft, of which Governor Hutchinſon juſtifies the exerciſe in America, and by which, ever ſince the noble Scotch lawyer has been the ignoble Engliſh ſtateſman, every meaſure of government has been ſo particularly marked and directed. This is the policy of the Dean, and inſomuch as there is merit in this, to that merit he is juſtly entitled. He wells knows, both from hiſtory and

 experience,

experience, that it is the nature of man *moſt* to believe what *leaſt* he comprehends: that *credo quia impoſſibile eſt*, is a maxim of the ſtate as well as of the church; and that hence the greateſt abſurdities in both have ever been beſt received: that ſingularity, novelty, flat contradictions of right, bold aſſertions of wrong, are the all-fours upon which *popularities* take their career. Thus the quack-doctor knows, and there are quack-doctors of various denominations, that the tincture of abſurdity is the beſt vehicle of his noſtrums; and that with the leaſt mixture of reaſon they would never go down with the public. For this reaſon, the ſtate-doctor, Dictionary Johnſon, cries out for fleets and for armies for America; and, treating the body politic, as the French doctors do the body natural, maintains, that the beſt cure for a fever is to bleed the patient into a conſumption. This method of cure I had like once to have experienced myſelf, and therefore may venture to pronounce it a practice ill ſuited, at leaſt, to an *Engliſh conſtitution*. On the ſame ground, our trade-doctor here, his deanſhip, declares; that to cut off the reſources of a kingdom is the ready means of increaſe, to its wealth and its power: that to leave the commerce of America *open* to the world, is the ſure way of *confining* to Great-Britain the advantages of it. If theſe poſitions werein telligible, who could believe them? As they are not, they are ſwallowed up in belief, with the blind avidity of the vulture,

that

that ignorant of its fate, feeds on its entrails, and conſumes its own life.

So much for the politician. Now a word for the divine: but firſt attend to what he relates of himſelf. In the preface to the firſt four of his tracts, he ſays, "I have been repeatedly accuſed of making trade my religion; and, that according to my theory, the greateſt merchant is therefore the beſt chriſtian. Another bill brought againſt me is, that I am extremely ignorant in my peculiar profeſſion as a divine; and, that having dedicated too much of my time to the ſtudy of commerce, I have ſhamefully neglected to cultivate thoſe ſciences, which more immediately belong to my clerical profeſſion." As I have already given the Dean the knowledge due to him in the ſcience of ſtate-craft, it would ſeem unhandſome in me, eſpecially as he complains ſo heavily himſelf of being thought wanting in the ſciences more immediately belonging to his clerical profeſſion, not to allow him, at leaſt, as much ſkill in the ſcience of prieſt-craft. You will ſay, perhaps, that a knowledge of the one, neceſſarily implies a knowledge of the other; for that ſtate-craft and prieſt-craft, though not ſynonyms in language and truth, are evidently ſo in practice and conſtruction; and therefore defineable only; as for example, to *accommodate*: now to *accommodate* is *accommodare*; and what is *acommodare*? Why it is to *accommodate*; and ſo the one *accommodates* the

other. But be this as it may, certain it is, that the very reverſe of what others accuſe the Dean is the truth with me. I contend, that inſtead of making trade his religion, he means to make religion his trade; and, according to this theory, the beſt chriſtian is therefore the greateſt prelate. With this perſuaſion then, although the deanery may make the dean a good chriſtian, as no doubt it does, yet wiſhing, as it is his duty to do, to become a better, I pronounce his *tracts* ſo many *high-roads* to preferment, *five tricks* for tranſlation, or one entire *volo* in order to a *nolo epiſcopari.*

But, I find, I am exceeding the limits of a letter: ſo hoping ſoon, very ſoon, to hear from you in the way of my wiſhes, adieu for the preſent. I reſt

Dear Sir,
Yours, &c. &c.*

Here again, after committing your tracts to the company of their fellow-phamphlets in the duſty confines of an unfrequented drawer, and placing their contents, with the reſt of the lumber of my head, out of the reach of my memory; you and they had remained undiſturbed in the tranquility of oblivion

* Underſtanding from the gentleman to whom this letter was addreſſed, that he intended to make uſe of it in print, as he is ſince dead, and not knowing into whoſe hands his papers have fallen; I have judged it right, rather to give a tranſcript here of the original entire, than by any alterations or omiſſions to make it differ from itſelf in any other publication that may poſſibly be.

livion and neglect: but when I found that (not content to ſow, by every ſpecies of inflammatory argument, and miſrepreſented ſtory, the tares of civil diſcord in the ſtate, contrary to thoſe practical duties of your calling, which preach peace, and love, and brotherly union; nay, even, by every eſſay in your power, to ſever the empire from itſelf, againſt the ſenſe and ſpirit of that goſpel-truth which declares, that "a houſe divided againſt itſelf cannot "ſtand") you had proceeded, boldly perſevering in error, to call forth, by "Humble Addreſs, and Earneſt Appeal," the *landed* againſt the *commercial* intereſt of the nation; pitting them, at it were, in battle array, the one againſt the other, and reviving the unnatural diſtinction equally ruinous to both: when I underſtood that this your project of wilful ſeparation, inſane as it is, was adopted as the alternative to abſolute conqueſt over, and unconditional ſubmiſſion in America, by a noble law lord, who, though not *really*, is *virtually* at the helm of ſtate, with power and deſign to ſteer the imperial veſſel on that Scylla, or on this Charybdis: I ſay, when I perceived that theſe things were ſo, my exclamation was, and my opinion is, *that your end is wicked, and your means are worſe.*

Having now delivered my opinions, as I had undertaken to do, concerning you and your project; it needs muſt, before I proceed any farther, that I ſay ſomething concerning myſelf. Conſcious of my own inability,

and want of power, to enter the field of political combat with ſo experienced a champion as yourſelf; and therefore feeling, as I cannot fail to do, the weight of that guantlet which you have thrown down, and I have taken upon my hands: yet, feeble as I am, foiled as I may be in the event, I ſtill truſt that I ſhall be found not wholly defenceleſs on that ground of motive and principle, which has led me to the unequal conteſt. Born under a free government, it is individually the birth-right of every member thereof, freely to enquire into thoſe meaſures by which he is governed. Lord Bolingbroke ſays, and no authority is greater; "That in a country cir-
"cumſtanced as ours, and under a govern-
"ment conſtituted as ours, the people have
"a right to be informed and to reaſon about
"public affairs; that when wiſe and honeſt
"meaſures are purſued, and the nation reaps
"the advantage of them, the exerciſe of this
"right will always be agreeable to the men
"in power; that indeed if weak and wicked
"meaſures are purſued, the men in power
"might find the exerciſe of this right diſa-
"greeable, inconvenient, and ſometimes dan-
"gerous to them: but even in this caſe, there
"would be no pretence for attempting to de-
"prive the people of this right, or for diſ-
"couraging the exerciſe of it; and that to for-
"bid men to complain when they ſuffer, would
"be an inſtance of tyranny but one degree
"below that which the triumvirs gave du-
"ring

" ring the ſlaughter and terror of proſcrip-
" tions, when by edict they commanded all
" men to be merry upon pain of death."
Now, however far removed I am from this right of enquiry, however incompetent to the taſk of reaſoning about public affairs; yet being convinced, that poſſeſſed of the right, the exerciſe of it, *at this awful criſis*, is not only indiſpenſable, but that to be ſilent is to be criminal: that circumſtanced as I am, not indeed as the American himſelf is, whoſe houſe is already on fire, but as his next-door neighbour, the Weſt-Indian, whoſe houſe is meant to be conſumed by the ſame combuſtibles; I ſay, under theſe circumſtances, as not to cry out, would be to deſerve the conflagration; ſo will I not ceaſe to complain, though the triumvirs (and this country hath its triumvirs too) ſhould command it upon pain of death. Such being my motives, I flatter myſelf, that they will in ſome meaſure be a plea of juſtification for my preſumption: but my principles too having led me to this arduous undertaking, a declaration of them becomes the more neceſſary, as it has been, and is the practice of you, and of every other anticonſtitutional writer on the American ſubject, to falſify the principles of thoſe who have differed, I will not ſay in ſentiment, becauſe truth muſt be the ſame to all, but in what you have been corrupted by your own hearts, or by other means, to profeſs. You, in particular, have been induced to frame a net, to which you have given the *new*

name

name of "*republiciſm*;" and with this net, like the miraculous draught of fiſhes, you catch all the Whigs at a haul. In order therefore to keep myſelf out of this ſnare, as well as to ſhew by what principles I a n influenced, I ſhall here, looking up to you as my father-confeſſor, and confeſſing my political creed in general, declare alſo, in particular, my faith and belief in and of the *trinity* of our conſtitution, as compoſed of king, lords, and commons, *in unity*.†

In the firſt place then, I hold the preſervation, protection and ſecurity, of life, liberty, and property, to be the *cauſa cauſans*, the object and end (however perverted) of all civil ſociety: that all government is of human and not of divine inſtitution: and that as all power originally is, ſo does it ultimately reſide in the people.

In the next place, I avow myſelf to be as much an enemy to republiciſm or democracy, as I am implacably ſo to abſolute monarchy; the effect of the former being that of too *little* government, or anarchy, whilſt the reſult of the latter is that of too *much* government, or deſpotiſm. The ſame objection holds good to ariſtocracy as to abſolute monarchy. The mixed government, or conſtitution of England, therefore, as confirmed at the Revolution, and

† It is to be hoped that the expreſſion *trinity in unity* will not be conſidered as any intended profanation of it: indeed no mode of ſpeech can be profane which is applied to the Engliſh conſtitution, in its perfect ſtate: but here the terms are *literally* and not *metaphyſically* meant.

and by expreſs compact in the act of ſettlement, with the preſent illuſtrious houſe of Hanover, is, equally with the eſtabliſhed religion of the church, as founded in proteſtantiſm, and with all their faults, like Hamlet's ghoſt, upon their heads, the objects of my maintenance and eſteem. To the crown and dignity of the king I owe the firmeſt loyalty and attachment, and to his perſon and government all due allegiance; ſo long as in the judgment of the public, and as by his coronation-oath, as well as by law, he is bound to do, he ſhall protect, and no longer, the conſtitutional liberties of his ſubjects. I ſay, I owe all *due* allegiance, becauſe allegiance and protection are terms of reciprocal duties only. "The right "of princes," ſays a learned author, "ari-"ſing out of our legiſlature, the ſetting that "aſide, deſtroys the foundation of their own "authority, and ſo releaſes the ſubject." To the houſes of parliament I owe all honour and reſpect. To the lords honour, becauſe honour is due; not only by reaſon of their conſtituting the nobleſt and moſt unblemiſhed tribunal of juſtice in the known world, but for the part alloted them in holding the balance of the ſtate. To the commons reſpect, for the honeſty of ſome houſes, notwithſtanding the corruption of others; and becauſe of their *capacity* to promote the happineſs of their fellow-ſubjects.

Again: another net by which you enſnare, or rather *argumentum baculinum* with

you and your fraternity down with all the Whigs at a blow, is, that they are the abettors of faction; and moreover you curſe them by the name of patriots. To the firſt of theſe charges I plead not guilty; putting thereby, in caſe of my arraignment, the proof of my guilt upon you: but I will add, that, connected with no party of men of any deſcription whatever, I enjoy the ſolid comfort of independence, and the heart-felt happineſs of being the ſole maſter of my own conduct, thoughts, and opinions. To ſay that I do not venerate the characters of thoſe Britiſh worthies, who have ſtedfaſtly and unbiaſſedly maintained and upheld the rights of humanity, in the cauſe and conſtitution of their country, would be to deny what I am moſt truly proud to confeſs; and yet, even with them, be it equally my pride to declare, that I would not mount, as St. Paul did, into the third heavens, nor be carried as Mahomet was, aſtride his beaſt *Alborak*, through ſeven heavens, upon the back of faction. As to the ſecond charge, if patriotiſm be a curſe, let me pray to God to ſend me grace that I become a patriot; and to this prayer, let you and all your brethren ſay, *amen*.

Theſe are the banners under which I fight, under which I live, and under which I chooſe to die. If this be republiciſm, I glory in the profeſſion. If this is to be a Whig, may I be caught in your net, may I be knocked down by your club, may I be curſed with your curſe,

curſe, ſo that I am fairly diſtinguiſhed from a Tory.* But one word more before I have done with myſelf.

If in what I have already advanced, or perchance may heareafter advance, reſpecting you, it ſhould appear as if I had treated your reverence rather too irreverently, or cavalierly, or roundheadedly, if the term better befits me, than I ought to have done; having my pardon in my pocket, I will plead it in bar of my trial.

My pardon is the following note of your own, in page 16, of your "Humble Addreſs "and Earneſt Appeal," &c. &c. "In the year "of the rebellion, 1745, and for many years "afterwards, the *London Evening Poſt* (now "a republican) was then a flaming Jacobite "paper: during which period, the author of "theſe tracts had frequently the honour of "being abuſed by him, under the character "of *a low-church, fanatical, Oliverian Whig.*

* "*Tory*," ſays Rapin, "is an Iriſh word, ſignifying *rob-*"*ber.*" He ſays too, "that Tories in general are fierce and "haughty; that they are exceedingly paſſionate, and preci-"pitate in their motions, which often diſconcerts all their "projects; and that when they have the reins in their "hands, they drive with amazing rapidity." It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that any one ſhould wiſh to be diſtinguiſhed from theſe banditti; for theſe are the Tories alluded to, and not thoſe who ſo humble themſelves into Whigs, as not to be diſtinguiſhed from them: meaning at the ſame time thoſe Whigs, who, as Rapin adds of them, "ſupport a good "cauſe, namely, the conſtitution of the government as eſta-"bliſhed by law." See Diſſert. de M. Rapin Thoyras, ſur les Wighs & les Torys.

" Once in particular, (above twenty years " ago) he was complimented in the high- " flown ſtrain of *Joſiah ben Tucker ben Judas* " *Iſcariot.* The times are now greatly alter- " ed; and ſo is the tone of the abuſe. But " the author is perfectly reſigned to theſe vi- " ciſſitudes of human affairs; and he has no " other favour to aſk of this, and of all his " *brother ſcribblers*, whether weekly or month- " ly, in ſheets or in pamphlets, than that they " would *never* praiſe him; becauſe that, and " that only, he ſhould look upon to be a *real* " *diſgrace.*" Now this will lead me to the relation of a ſtory, which I have either read or heard, I know not which, nor do I remember where: but it is ſhortly this. Cardinal Mazarin valuing himſelf much upon being the politeſt man of his time in France, Louis the Fourteenth became, on this account, jealous of him; thinking, that as he was the firſt *man*, he had a right alſo to be the firſt *gentleman*; and therefore ſeized every occaſion of contraſting his addreſs with that of the Cardinal's. One day, in particular, as the King, in company with the Cardinal, was coming from his coach, and going into his palace, he took it into his head to ſtop ſhort at the threſhold, and to make a ſign with his hand, that the Cardinal ſhould enter before him. Mazarin, hurt at the indecorum of preceding his maſter, ſhrugged up his ſhoulders, as the French are wont to do, and bowed his excuſe; upon which Lewis exultingly ſaid, Cardinal, from

this day you muſt yield the palm of good-breeding to me: it was mine to command, it was yours to obey; *to give way* to your ſuperiors, is to do as you are bid.

Under this impreſſion then, am I faſhioned, with relation to you. As a *brother ſcribbler* you have bid me *never to praiſe you*, becauſe that, and that only, would be *a real diſgrace*. As my ſuperior in *ſcribbling*, in civility I am taught to obey; and therefore my endeavours have been to *diſpraiſe* you, as the poſſible means only of obtaining your *praiſe*. Had the Cardinal been thus complaiſant to the King, of politeneſs the Cardinal had reigned the king. At preſent, my only concern is, that my compliment of *Joſiah ben Joſhua ben the choſen of God*, will fall ſo far ſhort of the truth, and of that high-flown ſtrain, of *Joſiah ben Tucker ben Judas Iſcariot*; that, in compariſon therewith, by judgment of *Miſnomer*, my plea will be over-ruled. In this caſe then, as humble ſubmiſſion muſt ſupply the place of my pardon, and as he that is not aſhamed to attack anonymouſly a name, ſhould at leaſt have impudence enough not to be aſhamed of his own; ſo, therefore, have I, here crying mercy of the public, given up my name, with myſelf, to whatever pleaſantries or cenſures you may think fit to paſs upon either or both.

I come now to the conſideration of your "Humble Addreſs and Earneſt Appeal," &c. concerning which I muſt previouſly obſerve, that after beginning very properly as you did,

with

with an apology for yourſelf, (knowing how much you ſtood in need of one) and then, by referring the reader to your former tracts, "waving the conſideration of every thing "that might have a tendency to keep the pre-"ſent queſtion out of ſight," for theſe are your words; yet ſo enchanting to you is the American theſis at large, that by *remark upon remark*, by *poſtſcript*, and by *a general muſter of forces*, you at length recapitulate, and bring back to the reader, whatever he was *elſewhere* directed to find. Now to trace you through this ſeries of tracts, would be to take upon me the Herculean labour of cleanſing the Augean ſtable; and as a river of water was required to waſh away the thirty years filth of the one, ſo would a river of ink be found neceſſary to blot out the manifold offences of the other. If, therefore, in the courſe of what I have to offer, I ſhall ſubſtantially anſwer the ſubſtance of your "Humble Addreſs and Earneſt Appeal;" and as in doing this, I ſhall not think fit to follow you paragraph by paragraph, or even page by page therein; ſo in fulfilling my own purpoſes, I truſt not to diſappoint the expectations of others. Under this exemption then I return to the ſubject before me.

The firſt ground of your argument is a fact, with a queſtion ariſing out of that fact. The fact is "that Great Britain and her co-"lonies are at open war;" and the queſtion is, "what is to be done at the preſent criſis?"

By

By way of anſwer to this queſtion, there are three ſchemes propoſed: the parliamentary ſcheme, Mr. Burke's, and your own. The parliamentary ſcheme is, by your account, " to " maintain *vi & armis*, the ſupremacy of the " mother country over her colonies, in as full " and as ample a manner as over *any part* of " the Britiſh dominions." Here your very commencement is an intentional deception: for does the parliament maintain *vi & armis*, or by any other means, the ſupremacy of the mother country, in the exerciſe of taxation, over Ireland? And is not Ireland *a part* of the Britiſh dominions, and, *according to your own ſhewing*, equally ſubject, with the colonies, to Britiſh parliamentary taxation? How then can you ſay, " the parliamentary ſcheme is to main- " tain *vi & armis*, the ſupremacy of the mo- " ther country over her colonies, in as full " and as ample a manner as over *any part* of " the Britiſh dominions," when the ſupremacy of the mother country is not maintained " in " as full and as ample a manner" over Ireland, although *a part* of the Britiſh dominions? Is not this contradictory to the fact? and do you not, in your conſcience, know, that the very reverſe of this is the cauſe that " Great " Britain and her colonies are at open war?"

The next ſcheme is that of Mr. Burke's: concerning which, after ſaying that it is not what you repreſent it to be, I ſhall be totally ſilent; meaning, by my ſilence, to convey a

ſenſe and approbation thereof, which my poor language would but diſgrace in the expreſſion.

The third ſcheme is your own, and it is this; "to ſeparate totally from the colonies, "and to reject them from being fellow-mem-"bers and joint-partakers with us in the pri-"vileges and advantages of the Britiſh-em-"pire, becauſe they *refuſe* to ſubmit to the "authority and juriſdiction of the Britiſh "legiſlature." Now admitting your ſcheme of ſeparation to be a good one, let me appeal to any impartial perſon, I will even appeal to yourſelf, in the cool moments of your reflection, if any ſuch you have upon this ſubject, whether the reaſon aſſigned for it by you, is fairly and ingenuouſly put: becauſe, ſay you, "they refuſe to ſubmit to the authority and "juriſdiction of the Britiſh legiſlature." A robber meets me in the ſtreet, and demands my money: I *refuſe* to deliver it: he knocks me down, and otherwiſe maltreats me: I indict him for an aſſault; his counſel argue, that if I had not *refuſed* the demand, the aſſault had not been committed; and therefore juſtify the offence. Is not this *componere magna cum parvis*, a more equitable ſtate of the caſe? But having brought your information, (ſhall I ſay, as in other caſes, *tam pro domino rege, quam pro ſeipſo?*) afraid of the verdict, you proceed to challenge the jury, and except to the panel.

And firſt, you "except againſt courtiers "and placemen, conſidered as ſuch;" and then,

then, throwing out, as it were, your flag of independence, you add, " that ſince your ad-
" vancement to the deanery of Gloceſter, in
" the year 1758, you have neither directly
" nor indirectly, made the leaſt, or the moſt
" diſtant application, for any other or higher
" ſtation." Now had you gone on to have ſaid, that you do not *now* mean " directly nor
" indirectly to make the leaſt or moſt diſtant
" application," nor hereafter to accept " of any
" other or higher ſtation," then, indeed, it might have been ſuppoſed, that you intended to come to an anchor on this boaſted ground of content: but, inſtead of this, (and your own words are my authority) like a pilot well ſkilled in the political compaſs, whoſe needle without a metaphor points to the *north*, dexterouſly trimming your bark, you veer about again, and ſteer for the land of preferment. Your words are theſe: " moreover, I do not
" make this exception againſt courtiers from
" any *bad opinion* I have conceived of the *pre-*
" *ſent ſet* of miniſters; for I think it may be
" fairly allowed, without paying them any
" compliment, that they are to the full as
" *able*, and as *honeſt*, as the beſt of thoſe who
" are endeavouring to ſupplant them." Until, therefore, I have ſome proof, more ſufficient of your ſpirit of independence, than as yet you have ſhewn, I muſt hold to my opinion, and ſtill cleave to my text of *nolo epiſcopari*.

Secondly, "You particularly except againſt "the whole band of mock patriots." This is a legal exception, though not for the wild reaſons you urge in the ſupport of it.

Thirdly, "You object againſt all thoſe of "whatever denomination, from the roaring "patriot in the ſenate, to the miſerable ſcrib-"bler in the garret, who are the penſioners "of France or Spain, or of any other rival "power." Of this exception, I am apt to ſuſpect, from the note that immediately follows it, and from its inapplicability to the preſent times, that it was conceived, at leaſt ſo long ago, as when the London Evening-poſt was a Jacobite paper, and uſed to compliment you out of your name, in the ſtrain of *Joſiah ben Tucker ben Judas Iſcariot*; for after attending minutely to the *all*, and the *much* you have ſaid thereupon, I can find nothing to the preſent purpoſe, except the ſcripture quotation; "beware of *falſe* prophets, who come to you "in ſheep's cloathing, but inwardly they are "ravening wolves."

Fourthly, "You expreſſly except all per-"ſons of republican principles, for very ob-"vious reaſons;" and therefore, as your reaſons are very obvious, there can be no reaſon for me to take notice of them. But here ending your exceptions, pray now, let me aſk you, why did you not except againſt Tories and Jacobites? You will tell me, perhaps, that you have done ſo, in excepting againſt the preſent ſet of courtiers and placemen. If you do,

remem-

remembering the ſtory of the king and the cardinal, out of good breeding, I ſhall not contradict you: but are theſe all the Tories and Jacobites that as jurors might ſerve in your cauſe? Would to God that they were! For then as your cauſe would be never put upon trial, ſo might one live in the hope of ſeeing an end put to them. The truth however is, that had you excepted againſt Tories and Jacobites, you would really have wanted a jury to have determined your cauſe.

Thus then, a jury of your own packing being ſtruck, your next buſineſs is to make choice of your judges; and here, as if the *landed intereſt* were, without queſtion, of thoſe principles againſt which you had *not* excepted; "your humble requeſt is, that you may be "tried by the landed intereſt only." Now whether you are right or not in your choice, remains to be ſhewn: but that no deception may be wanting which might bias your judges, and ſo favour your cauſe; "good doctor "Pinch," (as Shakeſpeare ſays in *his* comedy of Errors) "thou art a conjurer;" for in addreſſing the landed intereſt, your ſpeech to them is to this effect: "My lords and gentlemen, "the thing is no ſooner *ſaid* than *done*." Riſe, "manifeſto, couched under the form of an "act of parliament." Up ſtarts manifeſto, couched as commanded, and at the trifling expence only of "pen, ink, paper and printing." This is quick work, I muſt own, doctor Pinch; but were you not afraid of offending,

by this magic manifeſto of yours, the author of the Quebeck act, and thoſe other magicians, whoſe peculiar privilege it is, to play theſe *wonderful* tricks with America?

"*Sed amoto quæramus ſeria ludo.*"

Your ſcheme of ſeparation being now at iſſue, and upon trial, contrary to the well-known benefits ariſing *univerſally* from commercial colonization, contrary to the advantages reſulting *peculiarly* therefrom to this country, by reaſon of its own inſignificancy, in point of ſize, on the face of the globe, by reaſons of locality, and by every other reaſon which could induce our wiſe forefathers to ſpend millions, and tens of millions, in the obtaining of colonies; I ſay, contrary to all theſe incontrovertible arguments and reaſons, is that doctrine of yours, which by "Humble Addreſs and Earneſt Appeal," you ſo zealouſly propound to the landed intereſt of England, and forſooth of Ireland too, for adoption. But what are the motives alledged by you as conducive to this deſirable end? The advantages you ſay are manifold, and yet (although I have gone out of my way to collect them) I have not been able to find more than the manifold number of ſix.

In your fourth tract, firſt edition, p. 206, the firſt advantage attendant on your ſcheme is, "that it will put a ſtop to our preſent emi-"grations." As this advantage is founded in inhumanity, ſo neither will it bear the light of

of political enquiry. The advantage propoſed is, that in order to pay " tax, and tythe, and " rent," individuals muſt be diveſted of their natural right to *loco-motion*; and againſt their will kept in poverty and in wretchedneſs, rather than be permitted to go where neither tax, nor tythe, nor rent is due; and where they might enjoy thoſe neceſſaries of life to which all mankind have in common a right. This is tyranny in the abſtract, and unworthy the American ſavage: but, politically ſpeaking, what you are anxious to put put a ſtop to, is the object of encouragement; for until you aſſerted to the contrary, I had ever looked upon colony emigrations as the leading contours of political wiſdom; and, if credit is to be given to political arithmetic, the ſuperlucration to the mother country by every colony-emigrant, in compariſon with a home-reſident, is in an exceſs, that demonſtration only makes credible. In the average of labour in any given country it is calculated, that if one head with another yield ſeven ſhillings *per annum* clear gain to the publick, over and above the nouriſhment of each, it is a ſufficient portion of national wealth, and as much as may fairly be reckoned upon: but what do the Britiſh emigrants in North-America alone produce to Great-Britain, as the price of their labour? Look to your own ſtated account of the annual exports thereto, procure a like ſtate of the imports therefrom, ſtrike the balance of this trade, as by re-exportation it makes part

of

of the general balance of trade; and then, dividing the balance by the number of emigrants, ſee what the quotient will be. I have not aſcertained the account, becauſe in the number of emigrants we might not be agreed: but be your numbers whatever conſiſtently they may, I am juſtified in affirming, that you will find the proportion of profit to be, as in the difference of ſeven ſhillings to ſeventeen pounds at leaſt; excluſively of thoſe capital articles, and contingent benefits ariſing to the nation, of ſhipping and ſeamen.

But laying aſide matters of calculation, let me appeal to matters of fact. In France (a country not only ſo extenſive, but ſtill ſo uncultivated, as, by a due attention to agriculture alone, would employ and ſubſiſt double its number of inhabitants; and where, from its variety of climates, one would think almoſt all external reſources might be internally found) the planting and rearing of colonies were the pride of the ſtate and the boaſt of its policy; until the arms of Great-Britain (and when I ſay the arms of Great-Britain, I muſt look up to that then great director of them, the preſent earl of Chatham, with all the reverence due to this ſtateſman *unique*) were deſtructive of both. I ſay again, that until this memorable æra, colony emigrations were ſo much the encouragement of France, that its ſubjects, who were deſirous of becoming coloniſts, were not only provided with veſſels for their paſſage, but were ſupplied at the pub-

lic

lic expence, with all neceſſary requiſites and materials; upon condition only of re-payment for the ſame, until the whole was diſcharged, with one third of their produce. This was, this is the policy of France, inſomuch as it has opportunity left for the excerciſe of it.

But what now ſhall I ſay of Spain, that half-holder of the American quarter of the globe? Here inded I muſt expect you to crow over me, perhaps even thrice, as the cock did when Peter denied Chriſt; though with this difference indeed, that cocks now-a-days do not crow by inſpiration as they formerly did. However, I know I may be hit in the teeth, that by colony-emigrations the mother country Spain is left in a deplorable ſtate of depopulation. Admitting the fact, though I deny your uſe and application of it; let us take comfort to ourſelves and think, with Mr. Pope, that "whatever is is right:" for if Spain can treat Great-Britain with that *haut en bas* which we have lately experienced, and to which our miniſters have ſo ſhamefully ſubmitted, unpeopled as that kingdom is; if peopled, its ſituation being better, our treatment of courſe would be worſe. But here the queſtion is, does this condition of Spain put a ſtop to theſe emigrations from thence? I have not heard that it does. Is it an argument againſt emigrations of this ſort? By no means, not. Spain is hurt by its emigrations, but I will tell you why, in a word. Spain is *prieſt-ridden.* This is the ſource of the evil.

Monaſteries hinder the propagation of mankind: the inquiſition drives out many people, and prevents others from ſupplying their places: *remota cauſa tollitur effectus.* It was Engliſh *prieſt-riding* that firſt peopled Engliſh America: England *rid* of this *riding*, the evil was turned into good.

How is it with Portugal then? I ſhould imagine, pretty nearly the ſame as with Spain, the ſuperſtitious influence of each, like their countries and their colonies, alike bordering the one upon the other.

But let us now turn our eyes towards Holland, that *embouchure* of confluent rivers, that manufactured country, made by encroachment on the ſea; and where, though man ſhould be amphibious to reſide, yet from the form of its government, and the idea of civil and religious liberty there, with emigrations continually encouraged and daily ſet on foot, the circulation of home-population continues the ſame.

The tranſition from Holland to England is eaſy. What then are the effects of emigration obſervable here? North-America is ſaid to contain at leaſt two millions of inhabitants, excluſively of its Aborigines, the Indians. In how much then is Great-Britain injured thereby? You ſay, "Britiſh or Iriſh emigrations are "to be conſidered as being very unfavourable "to the encreaſe of Engliſh ſailors, as well as "of Engliſh manufactures; and that the loſs "and detriment to the mother-country are ve-"ry great in both reſpects." Poſtlethwyate ſays,

ſays, (but he, I ſuppoſe, no more than Mr. Locke, is of any authority with you) "I am "of opinion, that the encreaſe of people in "the plantations, as it would encreaſe our "American trade in general, ſo it would *cer-* "*tainly* encreaſe the number of our people at "home." Now as you are determined to conſider things in direct oppoſition to the ideas of every one elſe, and to be ſpick and ſpan-new upon every ſubject; one word by way of anſwer might be as well as a book-full: but let me ſee, if upon this occaſion, you will not be found to contradict yourſelf. In the laſt war we had four hundred and twenty thouſand Britiſh ſoldiers and ſailors, and when I ſay Britiſh, I mean belonging to the Britiſh empire, at one time in Britiſh pay; a number exceeding in both, by one fourth, any former amount. At this time, North-America was peopling, and was peopled as I have ſtated above. This then is a flat contradiction to the firſt part of your aſſertion, "that Britiſh "or Iriſh emigrations are to be conſidered as "being very unfavourable to the encreaſe of "Engliſh *ſailors.*" But what has happened to our agriculture and manufactures? I will tell you: the former by continued expanſion, has at length reached the barren mountains of Scotland: the latter, I have it from authority, increaſed *during the laſt war* nearly three hundred thouſand pounds at an annual medium in conſumption by export. A wonderful occurrence this! conſidering the number of

hands employed in the war, how general the war was, and conſequently how many channels of trade muſt neceſſarily have been blocked up. It is ſince the war, however, that the plough is turned on its back, the diſtaff fallen to the ground, and the labourers of both, become the emigrants of America. Be your own words an anſwer to this, confuting that ſecond part of your aſſertion, "that emigrations are unfavourable to Engliſh *manufactures*." Your words are theſe: "How is it poſſible that after having contracted a debt of nearly 140,000,000l. we ſhould nevertheleſs be able to make more rapid progreſſes in all ſorts of improvements, uſeful and ornamental, public and private, agricolic and commercial, than any other nation ever did? Fact it is, that theſe improvements have been made of late years, and are daily making: and facts are ſtubborn things." If therefore manufactures, agriculture, commerce, are thus by your own account improved, and are ſtill improving; and yet, whilſt emigrants are continually emigrating to America, proviſion for the poor be found more expedient than ever, poor-rates riſing, new charities multiplying, robbers and rogues *of all ſorts* more numerous, criminal executions more frequent, lands and every ſpecies of commodity riſing in their value and price, the concluſion is; that the population of, and the migration to, is ſo much ſuperior to the depopulation of, and the emigration from this

this country, that to colony emigrations none but the dæmon of the ſtate would wiſh to put a ſtop. Making uſe then of your own argument, that "facts are ſtubborn things;" I leave what I have ſaid on this head, as a full anſwer to the third remark in your "Humble Addreſs and Earneſt Appeal," &c.

Your ſecond advantage is, that "we ſhall "ſave between three and four hundred thou- "ſand a year by being diſcharged from the "payment of any civil or military eſtabliſh- "ment belonging to the colonies." Their charters are altered, their common-law judges made dependent on the crown, the trial by jury taken from them, taxes levied upon them without their aſſent, their perſons ſubjected by tranſportation hither "to be butchered in the "court of King's-bench," as was wiſely and humanely obſerved by the great and the good lord Camden, courts of admiralty and vice-admiralty erected for them, with new powers to enforce that engine of deſpotiſm the *civil law*, troops quartered upon, and a ſtanding army kept up among, them, in time of peace: This is their civil and military eſtabliſhment; "for which generous benefaction," you add, "we receive at preſent no other return than "invectives and reproaches:" but which puts me in mind of the commons petition to Charles II. with the king's anſwer thereto, as recorded by the earl of Rocheſter. The petition is this:

In all humanity we crave
Our ſovereign may be our ſlave;
And humbly beg, that he may be
Betray'd by us moſt loyally:
And if he pleaſe once to lay down
His ſcepter, dignity, and crown,
We'll make him, for the time to come,
The greateſt prince in Chriſtendom.

Is not this *mutatis mutandis*, the counterpart of your "generous benefaction," and very much a-kin to what is expected of the Americans? The anſwer to the petition is;

Charles, at this time having no need,
Thanks you as much as if he did.

So anſwer the Americans: preferring the "luxury of being free," to that civilized ſtate of civil refinement ſo exquiſitely civilized, as to make them wiſh to kiſs the rod that galls their backs, to taſte the ſweets of cruel mercies, or court the joy of being killed with kindneſs.

But this advantage of yours is in the liſt of American grievances, and therefore may be obtained without a ſeparation. They ſay, and through their congreſs, *uno ore conclamant*, that "for the neceſſary ſupport of go-"vernment we ever were, and ever ſhall be "ready to provide:" but for which generous benefaction, to retort, and with much better grace too, your own charge upon you, *they* receive at preſent no other return than invectives and reproaches.

Your

Your third advantage is, "the ceaſing of "the payment of bounties on certain colony "productions which will be a great ſaving, "perhaps not leſs than 200,000l. a year." This is a ſpecies of ſaving as extraordinary in itſelf, as, I muſt confeſs, it is new to me. I ſhould conceive a *ſaving* of this ſort to be neceſſarily a *loſs* to the nation. It is true, 200,000l. may be annually *ſunk* in colony bounties: but beſides that this money returns home again doubling itſelf in the due courſe and channel of trade, it can be conſidered in no other light, than as ſo much money lent by the public, in order to receive ſo high an intereſt upon it as to make good to the lender, even the loſs of the principal. This is my idea of a colony-bounty: but if *the not paying* 200,000l. a year is to be conſidered as a national ſaving, *the paying* 200,000l. a year has been a national waſte; and therefore, according to your œconomicks, every miniſter of this country, from time immemorial, ſhould have been, as General Gage in his letter to General Waſhington elegantly expreſſes this cataſtrophe of life, *deſtined to the cord*; for having ſo bountifully ſquandered away the public money in bounties. I muſt hope however, that this parſimony of yours, does not extend to every ſpecies of bounty, or at leaſt, for your brethren's ſake the poor clergy, is exceptive of one; I mean queen Ann's bounty, as it is called. But further: in the ſecond remark of your "Humble Addreſs," &c. you ſay, "if we ſhould caſt our "eyes on the imports from Ruſſia only, will "any

" any one be ſo hardy as to maintain that the " imports from North-America are at all up- " on a par with them in any reſpect whate- " ver? Timber, for example, iron, hemp, flax " and flax ſeed, linen, yarn, ſkins and furs, " aſhes, tallow, hair, briſtles, &c. &c. Can " it be pretended with any appearance of truth, " that the imports of theſe articles (taking " one with the other) from North America, " will bear any compariſon with thoſe from " Ruſſia? And yet, to the ſhame and diſ- " grace of an enlightened commercial ſtate, ſe- " veral of theſe raw-materials are taxed if im- " ported from Ruſſia, in order to create a mo- " nopoly to North-America: and others when " imported from America, are not only al- " lowed to be entered duty-free, which is juſt " enough; but alſo have enjoyed for many " years the benefit of large and munificent " bounties given by the parliament of Great- " Britain." In another place you add, "the " imports of raw materials from Ruſſia, " which are every day increaſing, exceed thoſe " from North-America in goodneſs, in quan- " tity, in value, and in every reſpect to a ve- " ry great degree." Now who is it that reads this miſrepreſentation of yours (for ſo in fact it is) but muſt ſuppoſe you to be the conſul-elect of Ruſſia, employed by the Czarina at the court of London, to write *down* the American trade by writing *up* the Ruſſian; or that you were making a *raw material* of yourſelf, in order that this bountiful empreſs might exerciſe

erciſe her bounty upon you. If this be not the caſe, I proteſt, I can no otherwiſe account for your partiality towards Ruſſia; and more eſpecially ſo when I read your ſucceeding note upon this text. Your note is this. "A "few ſhallow half-ſighted politicians have ob- "jected to the trade with Ruſſia, becauſe the "balance, according to their narrow ideas, is "viſibly againſt us. But what balance do "they mean? Not the balance of induſtry, "for that is plainly in our favour; or in "other words, we export more manufactured "goods to Ruſſia than we receive from it. "And as to the balance of money, they ought "to have known that it is much more benefi- "cial to an induſtrious commercial country "to import raw materials (if it wants them) "than to import gold or ſilver; becauſe there "cannot be ſo many hands employed in the "manufacturing of theſe metals, as in the "working up of timber, iron, hemp, flax, "&c. &c. to their reſpective uſes!" Inaſmuch then as I am one of theſe ſhallow, half-ſighted, politicians myſelf; I may perhaps be able to inform you what balance is meant. In the firſt place is meant, I preſume, the poſſible balance (which is terribly againſt us indeed, and the worſt of all balances) of our not being able to procure at any rate from Ruſſia, theſe articles of timber, iron, hemp, flax and flax-ſeed, &c. &c. let our want of them be ever ſo great. What has been, may be again, and, from the preſent ſtate of the

northern

northern European powers, is more likely to happen than ever. Before we procured our pitch and tar from America, we had them from Sweden: but why did we not continue to have them from thence? The Swedes made a monopoly of theſe articles: they ſet their own prices upon them: they ſhut out our ſhips from, and employed their own ſolely in, this trade, to the advancement of themſelves, and the injury of us, as a naval power: they did more: for upon breaking out of the war with France in the year 1703, they with-held theſe ſupplies from us, when we had not in ſtore a ſufficiency for the equipment of our navy; and which gave occaſion to the then remark, "how much it was in the power of the king "of Sweden either to forward the fitting out of "the royal navy of England, or to keep it in "harbour." To obtain a ſupply, our envoy, Doctor Robinſon, was forced to petition the king of Sweden in perſon. His letter to Secretary Hedges on this occaſion, and which will afford you much inſtruction, concludes thus: "What difficulties there are in making "and bringing pitch and tar from *New-Eng-*"*land* I am not acquainted with, but take it "for granted, England had better give *one* "*third more* from thence, than have it at "ſuch uncertainties, and in ſo precarious a "manner, from other countries." Hence it was that bounties were given for the importing of theſe articles from the colonies in America. And what was the conſequence? We

not only obtained the very great advantage of becoming the exporters of pitch and tar ourſelves, for the ſupply of the reſt of Europe, but inſtead of paying *one third more* for them, as Doctor Robinſon thought it better for us to do, we paid *one third leſs*, which makes *two thirds* difference in the price; and ſo proves to demonſtration my poſition, that a *ſaving* of colony-bounties is neceſſarily a *loſs* to the nation; independently of that circumſtance of exchanging uncertainty for certainty, ſetting aſide thoſe moſt valuable conſiderations of ſhipping and ſeamen, and putting out of the queſtion, the benefit of having this money return to us through the wholeſome channel of trade.

It follows now then to aſk, what ſhould hinder Ruſſia from putting us hereafter, with reſpect to their trade, under the ſame ban of their empire, as Sweden formerly did? The great deſign of this great power is to obtain a maritime force, in which Great Britain is her rival; and great powers will brook no rivalſhip. Tar is already a monopoly in the hands of the Czarina herſelf. You will anſwer that Ruſſia is our ally. I reply, ſo was the houſe of Auſtria; and our once ſuppoſed moſt natural ally too: but the time came when we took part with Pruſſia againſt Auſtria, and the times are coming when

"*Serpentes avibus geminentur, tigribus agni.*"

I have heard it ſaid, that a treaty of alliance is on foot between the courts of London, France, and Spain: for what purpoſe let prophets prophecy.—The liberties of mankind are become the objects of univerſal extirpation.

Another balance of trade meant is, not as you *artfully* ſtate it, to wit, "that we export "more manufactured goods to Ruſſia than we "receive from it, and that it is more beneficial "to import raw materials than gold or ſil-"ver;" for this is true, and in this the balance of trade with Ruſſia is not againſt us: but it is not upon this ground that the balance of trade with Ruſſia is againſt us: I ſay then, that the balance of trade with Ruſſia being againſt us is, not becauſe the importation of *manufactured* goods from Ruſſia to Great Britain is not equal to the exportation of *manufactured* goods from Great Britain to Ruſſia; not becauſe it is not more beneficial to import raw materials than gold or ſilver: but becauſe, for the raw materials which Ruſſia imports to us, ſhe exports from us, not our manufactures, not our raw materials in exchange to balance the account, but our gold and ſilver, nay, our very coin; and here it is that the balance of trade with Ruſſia is *viſibly* againſt us. I repeat *viſibly*; for if theſe raw materials imported from Ruſſia were to be manufactured here for re-exportation, even in part, elſewhere; then the money we ſhould receive for them as re-exports, being probably tantamount to the money paid for them as imports, the balance of trade with

Ruſſia

Ruſſia would not in fact be againſt us: but as theſe raw materials are intended for home conſumption, inaſmuch as our gold and ſilver are given in payment for articles of home-conſumption *only*, in ſo much is the balance of trade with Ruſſia, in deſpite of falſe-colouring, and in defiance of contradiction, againſt Great Britain.

But having now exhauſted all your honey of argument to ſweeten the trade of Ruſſia, your next procedure is to deal out your gall, in order to embitter that of America. You ſay, "But I forgot: pitch, and tar, and indigo, are alſo raw materials of very great conſequence; and they are imported from North America, but not from Ruſſia: true; pitch and tar, if imported from Ruſſia would have paid an high duty; but when brought from America, they receive a very large bounty." In the remembering of tar, it is ſomewhat ſtrange to me, that, by a concatenation of ideas, you were not led to the recollecting of feathers too, as a raw material of very great conſequence; ſeeing that from tar and feathers proceed tarring and feathering, and from thence, if one may judge of the quantity to be uſed, by the number of thoſe who deſerve the uſe, feathers bid fair to become as much an American ſtaple as tar already is. That they may be ſo, I moſt heartily wiſh: for as the Marcheſe Beccaria, in his moſt excellent book of humanity, entitled, *Dei delitti, e delle Pene*, calls the taking

away of a man's life, *queſta inutile prodigalità di ſupplicj*; ſo, upon this principle, tarring and feathering being better than hanging, inſomuch will American feathers deſerve encouragement, in preference to Ruſſian hemp, converted into Tyburn halters. But perhaps it was for this very reaſon that you omitted the mention of feathers: for methinks I hear you ſay, why ſhould I point out other reſources for America? Already does America profit too much at the loſs of Ruſſia! Alas! What an enemy is Great Britain to its natural friend Ruſſia, and what a friend to its natural enemy America!

As to the indigo then of America: Why the indigo "is of a quality much inferior," you ſay, "to that which comes from other coun-
"tries, and a better ſort might be cultivated
"*(I muſt ſuppoſe by the Hottentots and the ne-*
"*groes)* on the coaſt of Africa, at a tenth
"part of the expence."

But now for your attack upon the taxable objects of America; and here you ſay, "I do
"maintain, that North America doth not
"ſupply Great Britain with great quantities
"of taxable objects; for, perhaps, hardly any
"civilized country in the world, of equal
"extent, and the ſame parallels of latitude,
"is ſo barren in that reſpect as North Ame-
"rica. At preſent, I recollect but two taxa-
"ble objects among all her ſtores, *viz.* rice
"and tobacco. In reſpect to rice, I do allow
"that it hath been cuſtomary to tax it; but

" as it is a raw material, and an article of " food, it ought never to have been taxed." Surely never did blindneſs lead the blind more aſtray, than prejudice hath miſled you. This is the country that is ſaid to poſſeſs by nature, what the terreſtrial globe beſide affords, except gold and ſilver mines; which it does not poſſeſs, perhaps, becauſe only they have not yet been explored: but of which the very barrenneſs marks the altitude of its proſperity as a ſtate to come. To prejudice too, is even added injuſtice by you. North America, under the preſſure of law, (and very properly ſo, whilſt that preſſure was intended not to cruſh, but to extract only what was for the good of the whole empire) being forbid to manufacture any thing, " *even the hobnail of a horſe-* " *ſhoe*," of courſe became obliged to export its raw materials, in order to carry on a trade with this country, which raw materials, you ſay, as raw materials ſhould not be taxed, and which, as coming from Ruſſia, you alſo ſay, is better than gold and ſilver; and yet, for all this, your charge is, that North America has but one taxable object, and therefore is branded by you with the epithet of being the moſt *barren* of any country under the ſame parallels of latitude.

Aware of all this force of argument againſt you, whenever it ſhould be applied, now comes your retreat; which to make good, you muſt approve yourſelf a much better general than you have hitherto appeared. You

ſay,

ſay, " Let the trade to North America be " what it may, of little importance, or " otherwiſe; it is a mere begging the queſ- " tion, and a moſt diſingenuous artifice to in- " ſinuate (as all advocates for America now " do) that this trade will be loſt, if a ſepa- " ration from the colonies ſhould enſue. On " the contrary, it is much more probable, " that when all parties ſhall be left at full li- " berty to do what they pleaſe, our North " American trade will be rather increaſed " than diminiſhed by ſuch a meaſure: becauſe " it is freedom, and not confinement, or mo- " nopoly, which encreaſes trade. And ſure " I am, that on this ſubject, hiſtory, and paſt " experience, as well as reaſon and argument, " are clearly on my ſide." If by reaſon and argument you mean what you have here adduced, namely, " Becauſe it is freedom, and " not confinement or monopoly, which in- " creaſes trade," this is too general reaſoning for ſo particular a ſubject; and as to hiſtory and experience, I defy *either* to produce an inſtance of an empire, where freedom is the baſis of it, wantonly ſeparating itſelf from itſelf, as you propoſe, for no other reaſon, than merely becauſe one part of it deſires to be equally free only, as the other. But if Ruſſia is ſo cruelly treated for the ſake of America, if Ruſſia can afford a better ſupply to this country than America, what ſignifies the loſs of the American trade? Why labour ſo to prove that it will *not* be loſt? And why ſo anxious

to

to point out the probability of its continuance, ſince Ruſſia can ſupply the loſs? The reaſon is plain: your premiſes are wrong; in order to make them right, you have drawn a concluſion that does not follow from them; and this concluſion being falſe in itſelf, your whole ſyllogiſm major, minor, and ſequela, is one jumble of error.

But to be more particular: is it not as much "a begging the queſtion" by you, and full as much, if not more ſo, "a diſingenuous arti-"fice" in you, to inſinuate, that this trade will *not* be loſt, if a ſeparation ſhould enſue, than it is in the advocates of America, who aſſert to the contrary? In my opinion it is, and my reaſons are theſe. In the firſt place, the very ceaſing of the bounties which you are for ſaving, will extirpate the materials upon which theſe bounties were granted. A thing cannot exiſt, when the very cauſe of its exiſtence is removed. Inſomuch then will the trade of America be loſt, as by theſe bounties it was made to extend. But the ſaving of theſe bounties, you will ſay, will make amends for the loſs of this trade. The abſurdity of this doctrine I have already expoſed. You will urge then, that theſe bounty materials form but a very inconſiderable part of the American trade, and that the reſt we ſhall certainly have. This too I deny, *manibus pedibuſque*. If the Americans complain now of the monopoly of their trade by this country, when that monopoly is taken off, is it not

not ſuppoſable, that a part, at leaſt, of what was uſed to be brought to this market will be carried to other markets? And if a part of what uſed to come hither be diverted elſewhere, the trade muſt *diminiſh*, and will not rather *increaſe*, as you ſay it will; notwithſtanding your reaſon and argument, your hiſtory and experience.

In the next place, whatever might be the event, with reſpect to the imports of America to, the exports from, this country thither, muſt undoubtedly be conſiderably diminiſhed. America, in caſe of a ſeparation from Great Britain, is under neither moral, legal, nor political obligation, not to manufacture its own materials. Inſomuch then as the greater intereſt of that continent can be made to give way to the leſſer, in ſuch degree will manufactures be promoted there, and conſequently in the ſame degree will the want of foreign manufactures leſſen.

Again: By a ſeparation, no neceſſity remains to America for purchaſing the manufactures of Great Britain, in preference to thoſe of any other country; and if no neceſſity remains, it cannot be the object of its choice: becauſe it is not for its intereſt ſo to do. No one can believe that, a ſeparation having taken place, the Americans will bring their raw-materials to this country, (perhaps to be taxed, in order to create a monopoly to Ruſſia, as you would adviſe) and will purchaſe the manufactures here at thoſe prices (beſides paying

paying duties and cuſtoms) which the taxes of one hundred and forty millions of national debt occaſion to be laid upon them, when they might carry their goods to France, and there procure the neceſſaries they require at 50 *per cent* cheaper. It may be urged, that although they may buy what they have occaſion for much cheaper in France, they may ſell what they want to diſpoſe of much dearer in England, which will bring it to the ſame thing as if they purchaſed what they ſtood in need of in England. This may be true: but what will follow? They will do as Ruſſia does at preſent: they will ſell us their raw materials, take ſome few of our manufactures in payment, and the remainder in ſpecie, in order to buy what they may want more at cheaper markets; by which means, what with Ruſſia, North-America, and other countries, we ſhall be at length ſo drained of our gold and our ſilver, that the bank of England, *if any ſuch thing ſhould exiſt*, will be forced to iſſue bank-notes as currency for the common occurrences of life in buſineſs.

But now admitting, for a moment, your manner of begging the queſtion; that is, "that "the trade will not be loſt, but will rather "increaſe, if a ſeparation from the colonies "ſhould enſue;" let me, in my turn, beg a queſtion, and aſk; Whether the trade with America be the *all* that Great-Britain has to loſe, or to fear the loſs of, in caſe of a ſeparation? At preſent the trade between theſe

countries is carried on in Engliſh-bottoms, to an amount of tonnage ſcarcely credible; and theſe again are navigated by Engliſh ſeamen in numbers as conſiderable. But ſhip-building is one of the principal branches of the American trade. If therefore a ſeparation ſhould take place, is it not natural to imagine, that the Americans will increaſe and promote this ſhip-building trade of theirs as much as may be? And what ſhould prevent their doing what Sweden formerly did? Granting then that they will trade with us, and even as you ſay, more than they do now; they will trade with us in their own veſſels, navigated by their own ſailors; and they will make us pay what prices they pleaſe for their commodities; ſo that although the trade be increaſed, our navigation is loſt. And is this loſs of navigation no loſs to Great Britain? Beſides we not only loſe our own navigation but the advantages of theirs alſo. Heretofore in the caſe of a war, American ſhips and American ſeamen were Engliſh ſhips and Engliſh ſeamen. In a future war, ſeparation having taken place, American ſhips and American ſeamen, may become French ſhips and French ſeamen; thereby reflecting poſitive, and if even in a ſtate of neutrality, negative injury upon Great-Britain, as may beſt ſuit with the policy and intereſt of that country.

Upon the ſame ſandy foundation as theſe arguments of yours are built, is your annexed account of the value of the exports from England

land to Germany and Holland, and to the North-American provinces, raiſed. Becauſe in the courſe of nine years from 1763 to 1772, the exports to Germany and Holland, being 30, 292, 126, 11, and thoſe to the revolted provinces only 20, 61, 23, 8, the former exceeding the latter in the ſum of 10, 233, 103, 7, 7, ſo therefore, for this is the end of your computation, the former is a more beneficial trade to Great-Britain than the latter in the proportion of this balance. A greater fallacy than this was ſurely never invented even by the *reformed* Peripatetics of Ariſtotle, in their ſchools of verbal logic: but this your ſcheme of ſeparation having occaſioned a twiſt in your head, every thing muſt be twiſted to your ſcheme; and therefore until you can ſee by viſion direct "how much more the half is "than the whole," or know how much better it is for this country to pay 200,000*l.* a year in bounties to its colonies for commodities which may be had without bounties through a foreign channel, argument is loſt, and reaſoning is in vain.

Your fourth advantage is, that "when we "are no longer connected with the colonies by "the imaginary tie of an identity of govern-"ment, then our merchant exporters and manu-"facturers will have a better chance of having "their debts paid than they have at preſent." Now this is as much as to ſay, that when debtors are under *no* obligation to pay their debts, they are more ready to pay them than when

they are under *ſome* obligation; which perhaps is proving too much: for the ſame argument goes to the puting down of the courts in Weſtminſter-Hall, and to depriving the lawyers of their fees. It may behove you therefore, not to preſs this advantage too far, leſt you bring this profeſſion on your back; and next to the *red-coats*, and the *black-coats*, and I may add the *petticoats*, you know the *long robe* is the moſt formidable *coat* of any.

Your fifth advantage is, "that after a ſepa-"ration from the colonies, our influence over "them will be much greater than ever it was, "ſince they began to feel their own weight "and importance." To this advantage I have naught to object: ſeeing that my comprehenſion does not extend ſo far (which is not your fault but my misfortune) as to make me underſtand, that where influence *ceaſes* there influence *begins*; or that the weight of influence, in one ſcale, preponderates in a ratio proportionate to the weight of oppoſition applied to it, in the other.

Your ſixth and laſt advantage is, "our Weſt-"India iſlands themſelves will receive ſignal "benefit from this ſeparation." A fine round aſſertion this! *totus, teres, atque rotundus*; and, in good truth, moſt worthy of you! But where is the proof! Proof! ſay you? I have no proof: let others prove the contrary. But negatives are not always to be proved. So much the better, you reply; for then dilemmas ariſe, and theſe are proofs enough for my

purpoſe. But ſeriouſly ſpeaking, what is it you can mean, by ſaying, that "our Weſt-In-"dia iſlands themſelves will receive ſignal "benefit by this ſeparation." Do you mean that in conſequence of this ſeparation from the continental colonies of America, a ſeparation from the Weſt-India iſlands muſt neceſſarily follow, and that hence the Weſt-India iſlands will receive ſignal benefit? No: as yet you do not ſeem to have bargained for this neither; whatever you may do in your next political tract: this would have been a pill too large for the nation to have ſwallowed; beſides it would have broke down the conſtitution at once: it will ſerve therefore for the next doſe, when the body politic will be thoroughly, though more gently, purged of all that rude uncivilized health it now enjoys. But if this is not your meaning, what elſe can it poſſibly be? Why? How? Wherefore receive ſignal benefit? To theſe queſtions not a word is to be found in anſwer: but inſtead of this, flying off from the ſubject as if by a repulſive force, gaſconading, and pluming yourſelf on the ſize and ſituation of the iſlands, as the happy means of their being held in ſubjection, you gravitate your abuſe on the inhabitants thereof, for having dared at any time, no matter for the provocation, to reſiſt the iron arm of power; and for preſuming to claim to themſelves thoſe rights which God and the Engliſh conſtitution have given them. Unable then to afford inſtruction to others,

deign

deign to be inſtructed yourſelf. On that day when a ſeparation ſhall take place, whether by will or neceſſity it is of no matter, between Great-Britain and North America; on that day the Weſt-India iſlands are loſt for ever to this country. Loſt! What then? Let them be loſt, we will find ſugar plantations in Ruſſia, you will ſay. Of the poſſibility of this I will not now diſpute or contend with you: but I will repeat my aſſertion, that the Weſt-India iſlands will be loſt forever to this country; and I will do more, and which is more than you have done, I will give you my reaſons for my aſſertion.

The inhabitants of theſe iſlands are not only dependent on America for the materials neceſſary to the carrying on of their manufactures, but that food by which they are fed muſt be had from *thence*; or they muſt periſh, and be cut off from the face of the earth. No other countries, from diſtance of ſituation and other circumſtances unneceſſary to mention, can ſupply them with what they want, *in kind and in meaſure*, ſufficient for their ſupport, ſave and except America; and if they could, the price of purchaſe would be beyond the ability of payment. As to materials for their manufactures, they have none of their own; I ſay none, in compariſon with their occaſions for them, though in moſt of the iſlands they have literally none; and the uncertainty of the ſeaſons, with the numbers of people that are to be maintained there, takes from them all dependance

dance whatſoever on a proviſional produce from their lands for ſubſiſtence. In proof of this I might furniſh you with facts in detail undeniable: but the time is coming, and with giant ſtrides too, when theſe facts, ſpeaking for thmſelves, will teach you and the nation at large wiſdom by woeful experience.

It juſt occurs to me to obſerve that perhaps, "by ſignal benefit to the Weſt-India iſlands," you may mean, that the American trade *thither* "will rather increaſe than diminiſh," as you ſay it will do *hither*, in conſequence of this ſeparation. If you do, although we agree in nothing elſe, I heartily coincide with you in ſuch a belief; and I will here take upon me to point out to you the very *quantum* of the increaſe: *even*, I will pronounce, *in the whole of the trade to the entire excluſion of this country.* The Scripture tells us, "we "cannot ſerve God and Mammon;" and though Great-Britain be the god of the Weſt-Indies, and America the Mammon, the beſt chriſtians among them (and there are to the full as good chriſtians there as here, though they have neither ſynods nor preſbyteries ſet over them) will hardly have faith enough to look up to *that* god and ſtarve, when they may look down upon this Mammon and ſatisfy their hunger. Great-Britain without America can neither ſupport nor protect the Weſt-India iſlands, America without Great-Britain can do the former, and will be able to do the latter; and then rue the conſequen-

ces

ces of a ſeparation, when too late to repent of the folly.

That you may now, not knowing, know the importance of this loſs of the iſlands, or if knowing you may not ſay of them hereafter, as you have done of the American colonies, that "they do not ſupply Great-Britain "with great quantities of taxable objects, &c." I ſhall beg leave, in the words of the very able and accurate Mr. Glover, * to ſtate how this matter truly is; I ſay truly, becauſe what he ſtates is from the irrefragable authority of official papers. His words are theſe: "the "groſs amount of imports at an annual me-"dium from theſe unfortunate iſlands exceeds "*four millions*: 190,000 caſks of ſugar and "rum, beſides many other articles, the bulky "loading for ſuch a multitude of veſſels, "more than authorize my aſſertion. Of "theſe annual *four millions*, the exchequer "receives its portion, the navigator and mer-"chant theirs; the reſt centers with the "planter; and how diſtributed by him? In "the purchaſe of 1,300,000l. in our exports "direct, and the largeſt part of 700,000l. "more in circuition through Africa for a "conſtant ſupply of negroes. What is left, "conſiderable as it may be among reſidents "here, is applied to home-conſumption, not

* See the evidence delivered on the petition preſented by the Weſt-India planters and merchants to the honourable houſe of commons, as it was introduced at the bar, and ſummed up by Mr. Glover.

"with

" with a ſparing hand, and to inveſtments,
" upholding the price of lands, and the cre-
" dit of public funds. At the ſame time they
" are furniſhing commodities to us of ſuch
" neceſſary uſe, which elſe muſt be paid for
" to foreigners, and with a ſuperfluity for fo-
" reign conſumption likewiſe. I avoid com-
" pariſon; but judge from this ſtate, how
" valuable a ſubject is the planter." In another place he ſays, " I have mentioned the *reve-*
" *nue*, and ſhall now be very conciſe upon
" that head. Deducting bounties and draw-
" backs, the *neat receipt* at the exchequer
" from duties and exciſe on Weſt-India pro-
" ductions, I venture to ſet at more than
" 700,000l."

So far Mr. Glover, with reſpect to the iſlands in general; and although enough to glut the glutton appetite of the moſt greedy financier, more ſtill remains to be added to the account in value of ſome of the iſlands in particular: as for inſtance: Barbadoes and the leeward iſlands pay a duty of 4½ *per cent* on the groſs produce of their lands, producing from forty to fifty thouſand pounds ſterling annually to the crown in aid of penſions; * and yet, unheard

* Jamaica, and the new iſlands do not pay this tax of 4½ *per cent*. An attempt was made to impoſe it on the latter, which affords matter of curious ſpeculation, if not of ſerious enquiry. The doctrine maintained is, that parliament have a right to tax the colonies. By the ſtatute of 34 Ed. I. commonly called *de tallagio non concedendo*, it is enacted, " That
" the king or his heirs, ſhall have no tallage or aid without

unheard of injuſtice! when the ſtamp-act paſſed, theſe iſlands were ſaddled with that tax equally with thoſe other iſlands, and with America, who had no ſuch burthen to bear on their backs.---But this requires ſome farther explication. At the time of paſſing the ſtamp-act, the pretended reaſon for it was, that America, contributed nothing to the ſupport of government here, nor even to the ſupport of its own government there; and therefore as this latter ought more eſpecially to be done, this tax was impoſed in order to that end. Plauſible enough this, and a well ſet trap, that did not fail to catch many unwary partizans. But Barbadoes and the leeward iſlands had paſſed acts of their own, thereby giving and granting this 4½ *per cent* duty expreſly for the purpoſe of maintaining their own governments; † towards which however not a ſhilling

" conſent of parliament." After the new iſlands were ceded to the *crown* of Great-Britain, and of courſe became part of the empire, a *proclamation* iſſues laying this tax of 4½ *per cent* on them. Now if parliament have a right to tax the colonies, this proclamation was contrary to law, and the miniſter who adviſed it anſwerable for the illegality of it. If the proclamation was legal, the parliament can have no right to tax the colonies; becauſe where the parliament has the right, the king has not: but if neither ſhould have the right, how then? It has, *ſome how or other*, been determined in the court of King's-bench, that the proclamation was illegal: but no further notice has been taken of it.

† The preamble to the clauſe in the act of Barbadoes granting this duty or impoſt of 4½ *per cent* is as follows: " And foraſmuch as nothing conduceth more to the peace " and proſperity of any place, and the protection of every " ſingle perſon therein, than that the public revenue there- " of, may be, in ſome meaſure, proportioned to the public " charges

ling is applied, excepting 2000l. ſterling annually to the Governor of Barbadoes, and the ſame to the Governor of the leeward iſlands, which two ſums are given, like ſome of your arguments, *ex abundanti*: for the former iſland pays its Governor 3000l. a year beſide, and the latter iſlands 2500l. in like manner; whilſt the ſurplus of the 4½ *per cent* is applied, as I obſerved before, in aid of penſions; and as by ſuch application of the money ariſing from this duty, theſe iſlands are forced to find other ways and means for the ſupport of their governments, they are thus *partially* as well as *doubly* taxed. The very reaſon then for impoſing the ſtamp-duty on America, was the very reaſon that it ſhould not have been impoſed on Barbadoes and the leeward iſlands: becauſe theſe iſlands not only maintain their own governments to the full, but pay from forty to fifty thouſand pounds a year ſterling

" charges and expences, and alſo well weighing the great " charges that there muſt be of neceſſity *in maintaining the* " *honour and dignity of his majeſty's authority here, the public* " *meeting of the ſeſſions, the often attendance of the council, the* " *reparation of the forts, the building a ſeſſions-houſe and priſon,* " and *all other public charges incumbent on the government*; do, " in conſideration thereof, give and grant, &c."

N. B. As to the firſt uſe appointed by this act for this duty; 2000l. ſterling is paid, with the addition of 3000l. currency out of the general fund in the iſland treaſury: as to the ſecond, this is paid out of the caſual revenue ariſing from fines and forfeitures: as to the third, nothing has ever been paid: as to the fourth and ſixth, theſe have been paid out of other taxes raiſed from time to time on the inhabitants: and as to the fifth, a ſeſſions-houſe and priſon were built by a particular tax at the coſt of 5000l.

towards the ſupport of this government; ſo far as ſupporting ſlaves of ſtate, hired by a ſtipend to obey their maſters (which is Penſionary Johnſon's definition of penſioners, and ſo far as this is true) can be called the ſupport of government. Well therefore, upon the very principles of theſe taſk-maſters of ours, may I ſay, unheard of injuſtice! And what a ſpecimen does this afford of America, and the Weſt-India iſlands, under Britiſh parliamentary taxation! But as I have ſpoken of the injuſtice of the ſtamp-act, I will ſay a ſhort word or two of the folly of it alſo, in order to prove how unqualified this country is to deviſe taxes, admitting even the right of impoſing them, for countries at three thouſand miles diſtance from it; and becauſe herein I can ſpeak from my own knowledge. When the ſtamp-act paſſed I rented the offices of regiſter in chancery and clerk of the crown in Barbadoes, from the patentee here, George Auguſtus Selwin eſquire, member of parliament for the city Gloceſter; and for which I paid, in behalf of a younger brother of mine, who was the deputy regiſter, and clerk of the crown, four hundred pounds ſterling a year. Here is, *entre nous*, another good penſion from this iſland, in the gift of the crown; with the clerk of the court's office, the ſecretary's, the marſhal's, all better penſions than this is; *cum multis aliis quæ*, &c. and without mentioning the government itſelf. This ſaid ſtamp-act then enacted, that all law proceedings

ings ſhould be had upon ſtamp-paper. Now the chief benefit of the regiſter's office in chancery, ariſes from appeals out of that court to the king and council here; and it muſt be noted, that no cauſes there are appealable upon, but ſuch as exceed 500l. the currency of that iſland. When the appeal-papers then were made out, as was the caſe in one ſuit during the forty days tyranny of this act, it appeared; that beſides other expences which are conſiderable, the charges for ſtamp-paper alone and from whence no advantage whatever accrued to the office, amounted to within one hundred and twenty pounds of the whole ſum upon which the appeal had been granted. The conſequence of this was, that the parties were not able to proſecute the appeal; there it reſted, and the door of juſtice was ſhut upon them. Alarmed at this public evil, as well as at the private injury to my brother, of having one half of the buſineſs of this office thus effectually cut off from him; I took the liberty, in a letter that I had the honour to write to the patentee, of ſtating theſe facts, as neceſſarily affecting his intereſt in the future letting of his office: and although I had not an anſwer from this gentleman (which in juſtice to his well known politeneſs, I attributed to the repeal of the ſtamp-act, that, ſoon after following, rendered it unneceſſary) I had the ſatisfaction not to be able to find his name in that liſt of the *minority* who voted *againſt* the repeal of this act; and therefore

ſuppoſed

ſuppoſed him of courſe in that conſiderate as well as conſiderable *majority* who voted *for* the repeal.

Another proof of the want of knowledge in this law, if by ſuch a name it can be called, for it enacts that to be done which is impoſſible, and *lex non cogit ad impoſſibilia*, was; that payment was required for the ſtamps in an amount not correſpondent with the current coin of the iſland: ſo that if one ſheet of paper was wanted, the purchaſer was obliged either to pay one third more for it, than the price ſet upon it was, or to buy three ſheets, he wanting only one; * and yet this is the law that was to have executed itſelf (as indeed I believe it would have done, in a different ſenſe of the words, for it could not otherwiſe have been executed) and which is looked upon to be the offspring of Policy begotten upon the body of Wiſdom.

Having thus anſwered your manifold advantages, being (though contrary to my intention of confining myſelf merely to the anſwering of your "Humble Addreſs and Earneſt

* The price of ſome of theſe ſtamps was 4d. ſterling a ſheet. Now the coin neareſt to this in Barbadoes is a *bit*, which is $7\frac{1}{2}$ currency, or 6d. ſterling. If then one ſheet only of theſe four-penny ſtamps was wanted, a *bit*, or 6d. ſterling muſt have been paid for it, which is one third more than the price that was ſet upon it: or, to avoid this overpayment, three ſheets muſt have been taken, which coming to 1s. at 4d. each ſterling, made it equal to two *bits* or twice $7\frac{1}{2}$. The reſt of the iſlands muſt have ſuffered in the ſame manner; and in ſome of the colonies in America, payment was required in ſpecie when paper-money was the only currency.

Appeal)" called upon ſo to do, by that vaunting paragraph of yours, where ſpeaking of your fourth tract, you ſay ; " and as the ar-
" guments there urged have never been at-
" tempted to be anſwered, notwithſtanding
" ſo much good will to do it, and that my
" opponents moſt certainly would do it, if
" they could, the natural concluſion is, that
" they are unanſwerable ;" I ſay then, that having committed this Iriſh blunder of anſwering what is unanſwerable ; I am put in mind to return to that part of your " Humble Addreſs and Earneſt Appeal" where Ireland is the ſubject matter of it.

And here you have two poſitions: Firſt, " that with reſpect to the claim of the legiſla-
" tive authority, which the parent ſtate makes
" over Ireland as well as America, both coun-
" tries are exactly on the ſame footing." Secondly, " The mother country hath not only
" aſſerted, but maintained her claims alike over
" both countries, in the affair of laying a gene-
" ral port-tax on all parts of the Britiſh empire ;
" ſo that in this reſpect likewiſe, both coun-
" tries are on a par." And yet your propoſal is, " an union with Ireland, and a ſepara-
" tion from America." And why ? Really for ſuch laughable reaſons, that one would think you were *after* laughing at Ireland yourſelf. You ſay, that " Britain and Ireland ought
" not to be ſeparated at all *(at all)* by different
" governments, laws, or parliaments;" *and becaſe why ?* " for example, the two great
" iſlands

" iſlands are ſeparated only by a *narrow* ſea." For the contrary reaſon then, I muſt preſume it is, that America is to be ſeparated from Britain ; that is, *becaſe why?* Britain and America are ſeparated by a *broad* ſea. But beſides this, you are downright offenſive to the underſtandings of the Iriſh : for, as if they did not know that this ſame thing called *union* was but another word for *Iriſh-taxation in general*, or *Iriſh land-tax in particular*, you would perſuade them to believe the very contrary of this. You tell them, that the principal objection, againſt an union, (which is the removal of the court and parliament from the city of Dublin) is the very beſt argument for it : for the city of Dublin would be a very great gainer by it ; and it would be a gainer, becauſe Edinburgh is now " three times, at " leaſt, as rich and flouriſhing as when it was " the reſidence of a court and of a parliament." If this be the caſe, London, by being the reſidence of a court and of a parliament, muſt of courſe be leſs rich and leſs flouriſhing, proportionally as Edinburgh is more rich and more flouriſhing : and why therefore is London to be ſtill more oppreſſed by the addition of another court, and another parliament from Dublin? This is contradictory to that now great leading principle of finance which bears down all other principles before it, that every colony ſhould ſhare its part in the burthens of the mother country ; and Ireland is a colony too as much as any in America : for it was

con-

conquered by Henry II, Dublin was colonized from Briſtol, and a civil adminiſtration eſtabliſhed there, with all the liberties and free cuſtoms, ſays the charter, which the citizens of Briſtol enjoyed. At preſent then Ireland, by bearing the burthen of its own court and its own parliament, does no more than it ought to do: whereas by the removal of that burthen hither, England is burthened thereby, and Ireland diſburthened. Suppoſe, therefore, inſtead of this, and as you are fond of ſchemes, you propoſe that the courts and parliaments, both of London and of Dublin, ſhould be removed to Edinburgh. Such a ſcheme would be very practicable, ſeeing that it would be very acceptable to all parties: for as London and Dublin, by being ſo long burthened with their courts and their parliaments, muſt now be grown weary of them; ſo the removal to Edinburgh, you may reſt on the great leading principle, that Scotland ſhould bear its ſhare in the burthens of England; and as Edinburgh is "at leaſt three times as "rich and as flouriſhing," and at leaſt three times as loyal too, as it was, it would gladly accept the propoſal if it were only in proof of its loyalty. Thus you may ſerve the three kingdoms at once, and in ſo doing, probably receive the thanks, and the freedom of the metropolis of each, with three gold boxes into the bargain. But now for your mottos to crown what you have ſaid hereupon. You are for an union

with Ireland, but a total ſeparation from America; and therefore your motto is, *vis unita fortior*. Mr. Burke is for preſerving the union of the empire, entire as it is, and *unſeparated*; and therefore his motto is, *divide, et impera*. Now, theſe mottos are ſo unlike to either of your meanings, and ſo unfit for you both; that, for my part, I muſt take them for errors of the preſs, which by a *vice verſa* arrangement will in the next edition rightly appear: as they now ſtand, no conſtruction can be made of the Latin; but by the tranſpoſition propoſed, the tranſlation is eaſy: for conſidering your motto as *divide et impera*, the conſtruction is, *divide*, ſeparate America from Great-Britain, *aut aliter*, divide the Whigs from the Tories, as the ſheep from the goats, *et impera*, and govern, *ſubintellegitur*, deſpotically. Taking Mr. Burke's motto for *vis unita fortior*, it is, *Anglicè redditum*, thus; united force (and of courſe not ſeparation) makes the Britiſh empire the ſtronger.

As this then is the ground of your union in expectancy, ſo, as things at preſent are, you maintain, that Ireland ſhould not be internally taxed, though America ſhould; and this *ſeeming* partiality, as you call it, you juſtify upon *four* points.

Your firſt point is, "that Ireland never "plunged us into any wars ſince the Revolu- "tion; whereas America hath involved us "in two, &c." How jeſuitically have you ſtated

ſtated this point! "*Since* the Revolution!" But what did Ireland do *before* the Revolulution? And to ſtick to matter of fact, what has it done ſince the Revolution? What was the ſtate of Ireland at the battle of the Boyne? when that popiſh tyrant, James II. exiled from this kingdom, was alſo driven out of that? Ireland not only then plunged us into a war, but was actually engaged in a war againſt us; ſo actually, and ſo worthy of memory too, as that our great political Meſſiah, ſent by the guardian angel of the conſtitution to preſerve it from the perſecutions of popery, and from tyranny, had like, by a rebel ſhot, to have loſt his precious life, before the happy end of his miſſion was accompliſhed.*

Your ſecond point is, "that Ireland doth "not drain us of any ſums of money to ſup- "port and maintain its civil and military eſta- "bliſhments; whereas America drains us for "thoſe purpoſes of upwards of 300,000l. an- "nually." To this point an anſwer has already been given. It has been ſaid, that the Americans are, and ever have been, ready to provide for the neceſſary ſupport of their governments. That they do not therefore do ſo, is not to be imputed to them; and why they do not do ſo, let miniſters tell: but leſt the information you ſhould receive be like the

* Biſhop Burnet, in his character of this our great deliverer King William ſays, "that he might be called in the words "of David" the man of God's right hand, whom he made ſtrong for himſelf.

news of the Gazette, not at all to be depended upon, the reaſon is this ; it would be lopping off miniſterial influence to that annual amount: which, ſo far from lopping off, your good friends the landed intereſt are ready, at 14s. land-tax in the pound, nay, even with their lives and fortunes, to increaſe.

Your third point is, " Ireland drains us of " no money, by way of bounty on the im- " portation of her goods, or natural produce, " into this kingdom ; whereas America hath " drained us of, at leaſt, 1,000,000l. ſterling, " for bounties on pitch and tar, on lumber, " indigo, &c. &c. within a few years." Now I do not mean to draw a compariſon to the injury of Ireland : far be it from me. I know well the hardſhips under which that country labours : I know too that were it not for the little, low, narrow, mean, groveling, financiering politics of Great-Britain ; Ireland might become a treaſure of wealth, and be made a mine of inexhauſtible riches to both : but, under its preſent circumſtances, in your own way, I will aſk you a queſtion or two. If we ſhould caſt our eyes on the imports from North-America only, will any one be ſo hardy as to maintain, that the imports from Ireland are at all upon a par with them in any reſpect whatever ? Do the taxable objects of Ireland bear any proportion to the *one* taxable object only of North-America ? Are the exports from this country to Ireland, to be compared with the exports from hence to North America in va-

lue? Unevaſive, direct anſwers, to theſe queſtions, will prove how unfair you have been in your compariſon of theſe countries; and how unjuſtly you have ſettled the account between them.

Your fourth point is, "Ireland is continually burthened with large penſions, ſome to "princes of the blood, ſome to other perſons, "and ſome to flaming patriots: for even pa-"triots will accept of penſions, if they can "get them, and then exclaim moſt bitterly, "O liberty! O my country! Whereas Ame-"rica is totally free from this ſpecies of tax-"ation, as far as I am able to trace the mat-"ter." This point, though laſt, not leaſt in conſequence, brings to my remembrance a debate that I not long ſince heard, upon the merits of it. A certain right honourable gentleman, not content with the thouſands and the tens of thouſands he was getting by the American war, but muſt put in his claim to an Iriſh war alſo, having aſſerted within doors, as you have done without, the right of this country to tax Ireland as well as America, was now called upon his legs, by that firſt of men in abilities, nay more, by that honeſt man, "the nobleſt work of God," I mean the *once* ſolicitor general of his Majeſty, Mr. Dunning, to juſtify what before he had ſaid; and being thus called up to this ſubject, as if having found that paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance were not now-a-days ſo eaſily had as imagined, and therefore it was in ſome de-

gree

gree neceſſary for him to explain away his meaning, he declared; " that although the " Britiſh parliament had an undoubted right " to tax Ireland, he never wiſhed to ſee that " right exerted there; nor ſhould he be an " advocate for the exerciſe of it in America, " *if America was but half as kind to this coun-* " *try as Ireland was.*" Struck with the newneſs of this poſition, I began to reflect, that to the naval ſtrength of this kingdom, America certainly added conſiderably more than Ireland poſſibly could do, view it in whatever light it was to be ſeen: that on the great baſis of trade, in exports from, and imports to this country, Ireland ſtood in no competition with America: that in point of finance, the revenue of this country, was largely more benefited by America than by Ireland; and therefore if the *decreaſe* of the national debt was the object of government, upon this ground alone, America inſtead of its being not half as kind, muſt neceſſarily be much more kind to Great-Britain than Ireland was. But in the midſt of theſe reflections, and whilſt I was endeavouring to ſolve this difficult problem, my underſtanding was enlightened by that patriot orator, Colonel Barré, (whoſe pardon I muſt entreat, for giving him a name that will ſo perſonally ſubject him to your abuſe) when he came to anſwer what had been thrown out upon this occaſion. From him I learned, that the kindneſs meant from Ireland

land to this country was, that Ireland ſuffered itſelf to be loaded by this country with *penſions* civil and military, to the amount of 87000l. a year, and upwards; "from which "ſpecies of taxation," as you ſay, "America "is totally free," ſo to which ſpecies of kindneſs, the Colonel added, "America will never "ſubmit." Upon theſe facts I leave you to make your own comments; and ſhall trouble you but with this ſingle remark of my own: Let Ireland take warning by the fate of the 4½ *per cent* iſlands in the Weſt-Indies, which, although half as kind, at leaſt, in the very kindneſs too of penſions, to this country, as Ireland is, were yet involved, without diſcrimination, in American taxation; and whoſe guitleſs inhabitants, cut off from ſubſiſtence by the one hand of power, without the ſmalleſt relief being pointed out even by the little finger of the other, and expoſed to rapine and plunder, are now not only in the fear of being deſpoiled of their property, but are left to the dreaded condition of cannibals as the alternative only to famine.

Having indirectly, and you have directly, mentioned the right of taxation; it would ſeem fit that I ſhould be ſomewhat more particular on this important head: but on a ſubject that has been ſo fully and ably diſcuſſed, and now ſo exhauſted, what more than what has already been ſaid, can further be added? To look for any thing new, one muſt do as Æſop did, when he wanted to find an honeſt man, ſearch with a candle and lantern.

tern. Leſt, however, I ſhould be charged with omiſſion, I will not leave unnoticed what has fallen from you : but that, in ſo doing, I might not be drawn, by an argumentative conteſt, into too extenſive a field; taking you upon your own ground, I will fix my ſtation there: content from your premiſes to draw a concluſion ſo differing from your own, as to make your own weapons to recoil upon yourſelf. You ſay, " the advocates for making " North America independent of the Britiſh " parliament, muſt if conſiſtent with themſelves, be for turning the Britiſh conſtitu- " tion into ſomething very different from " what it is at preſent, or ever was ; for the " very *plea* theſe men uſe in regard to North " America is, that *repreſentation*, and *legiſla- " tion* (a very ſmall part of which, is the po- " wer of raiſing taxes) muſt always go to- " gether." Here you make the advocates for America to *ſay* what they do not *ſay*, and therefore this *ſaying* of yours is mentioned but to be denied. Their plea is, and their plea will for ever be, that *taxation* and *repreſentation* are inſeparable, and not that " *re- " preſentation* and *legiſlation* muſt always go " together." It is you that would diſlodge them from this ſtrong hold, and confound their meaning, by changing the *terms* of their plea.

But now for your premiſes, which ſhall have their fulleſt ſcope. You ſay, " that tho' " ſome few only, perhaps not a fortieth part

" of

" of the inhabitants of the whole iſland, have " legal votes for repreſentatives, all in gene- " ral, both within the iſland, *nay without it*, " are *virtually* repreſented. That this is fact " and law, that this ever was the conſtitution " of the Britiſh empire, from the earlieſt " times down to the preſent day, is ſuch an " apparent truth, that it cannot be denied. " Therefore in this ſenſe it is true, and in *no* " *other*, that every member of the common- " wealth is ſuppoſed to give his previous con- " ſent to the making of thoſe laws, which " he is afterwards bound to obey, and to the " impoſing of thoſe taxes which he is obliged " to pay. Indeed upon this footing (viz. of " *virtual* repreſentation in ſome caſes, and of " *actual* election in others) a free and well- " poiſed government can ſtand, and be ſup- " ported; but it can be ſupported on no " other." Here then is the old ſtory over again of *real* and *virtual* repreſentation, from the " *controverſy reviewed*" * down to your " *Humble Addreſs*;" and over again, plainly too for want of a better ſtory, becauſe as often as it has been told, ſo often has it been refuted: but my deſign is not to make any attack upon the ſtory itſelf. On the contrary, I admit the facts of a *real* and a *virtaul* repreſentation, and ſhall contend about their conſequences only. To this end therefore I

* A pamphlet ſaid to be written by Mr. George Grenville.

will endeavour to methodiſe my ideas, and to lay them in ſome order before you.

Among the ſeveral *claſſes* of principles which form the Engliſh conſtitution (for every government, defined as a ſcience, is a ſyſtem of principles) there is *one* known by the name of *repreſentation.* Legiſlation is another, taxation a third, and ſo forth. Under this *claſs* then of *repreſentation*, are to be found *two kinds* of repreſentation; the one *real*, the other *virtual.* Under the firſt of theſe *kinds*, *real repreſentation*, are included all thoſe perſons who by freehold, *or otherwiſe*, have votes for the election of repreſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament. Under the ſecond of theſe kinds, *virtual repreſentation*, are included all ſuch as have *no* votes for the election of repreſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament; their qualifications conſiſting only in their being ſubjects of Great-Britain, no matter where reſident, nor how diſperſed, whether in Ireland, in Eaſt-India, in Weſt-India, in North-America, in South-America; in ſhort wherever exiſting *per totam terram*, by being Britiſh ſubjects, they are the objects of this *virtual repreſentation.* This then being the conſtitutional ſtate of this matter according to you, your concluſion is; that as *taxation* is one of the effects of this two-fold repreſentation, ſo every Britiſh ſubject is bound by taxation whenever exerciſed, under this general principle of repreſentation. So far I think I have proved that I clearly underſtand

derſtand you: but now, proceeding in the analyſis of this principle of the Engliſh conſtitution, in order to the diſcovery of its truth or falſhood, I hope I may be able to make myſelf equally intelligible to you. Having ſhewn what theſe two *kinds* of repreſentation *real* and *virtual* are, I perceive, in purſuing them through their ſubordinate relations, that they are ſubdivided into *four ſpecies* of repreſentation, ariſing *two* out of each *kind*. Out of the firſt *kind*, that is, out of *real* repreſentation, ariſes *two ſpecies*: the firſt *ſpecies* comprehends thoſe who have votes, by means of *freeholds* in lands or tenements of the yearly value of forty ſhillings, for the election of repreſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament; and theſe repreſentatives, repreſenting the *landed* intereſt of the kingdom, are called knights of the ſhire: the ſecond *ſpecies* comprehends thoſe who have votes *by charter, or cuſtom*, for the election of repreſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament; and theſe repreſentatives, repreſenting the *monied* or *trading* intereſt of the kingdom, are called citizens and burgeſſes. * Out of the ſecond *kind*, that is, out of *virtual* repreſentation, ariſes *two other ſpecies*: the firſt comprehends thoſe, who having *no* votes for the election of re-

* Beſides theſe two ſpecies of repreſentation of the landed and mercantile intereſt, there is a third, too inconſiderable however to be admitted as a diſtinct ſpecies; it comprehending only the four members of the two Univerſities, who were called to parliament, ſo lately as in the reign of James the Firſt, as repreſentatives for the rights of the republic of letters.

preſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament, neither by *freehold*, nor *charter*, nor *cuſtom*, have *yet* this ſecurity for their property; that, by having their property on the *ſame ſpot* where the property likewiſe of the repreſentatives is, they pay no other, nor higher *taxes*, but the *ſame* only, as the repreſentatives themſelves do: the ſecond comprehends thoſe who having *no* votes for the election of repreſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament, neither by *freehold*, nor *charter*, nor *cuſtom*, *nor* yet property on the ſpot where the repreſentatives themſelves have, ſuch as the Iriſh, the Eaſt-Indian, the Weſt-Indian, the North-American, the South-American; What is to become of them? What ſecurity have they for their property againſt Britiſh parliamentary taxation?

Thus by a ſimple deduction of facts, out of the reach of controverſy, a diſtinction ariſes creative of ſuch a difference betwixt theſe two laſt ſpecies of *virtual* repreſentation, as not only to make the latter of the two incompatible with the nature of the Engliſh conſtitution, but to deſtroy the very idea of repreſentation itſelf. I ſay incompatible with the Engliſh conſtitution, becauſe ſuch a diſpenſation as this is, is founded in the unequal diſtribution of juſtice, which is injuſtice; and becauſe it is moreover in direct contradiction to one of the firſt principles of the conſtitution, namely, *the ſecurity of property*. I ſay too that it deſtroys the very idea of repreſentation, for, as not even, like the enfeebled rays of reflected

light that terminate at length in darkneſs, does the ſhadow of the ſhadow even of *virtual* repreſentation here remain; ſo the ſecurity of property being the very end of repreſentation, where there is no ſecurity of property there can be no repreſentation.

But now I may be told that out of order I have drawn diſorder, that from light I have produced darkneſs; thereby leaving the conſtitution of England incompleat and defective. It is therefore incumbent on me, that, by ſhewing what becomes of thoſe, and explaining what ſecurity they have for their property, who have neither votes for the election of repreſentatives to ſerve in the Britiſh parliament, nor property on the ſpot where the repreſentatives themſelves have, I compleat my analyſis, reſtore the conſtitution to itſelf, and give a direct anſwer to this objection. Certain it is, that as this *ſecond ſpecies* of repreſentation here ſtands, there is a manifeſt defect in the Engliſh conſtitution: but it muſt be obſerved at the ſame time, that, as this conſtitution was originally formed for *internal* more than *external* uſe, this defect is rather *accidental* than *eſſential* to the ſyſtem; rather ingrafted upon it afterwards, than growing out of it at firſt. A defect however, of any ſort in the conſtitution, was not to be left without a remedy. In order therefore to ſupply by ſome mode of *practice* what was ſo apparently deficient in *theory*, that is, that the ſecurity of property, which is not only

only the end of repreſentation, but both the cauſe and effect of all ſocial compact, might be extended to every member of the conſtitution, thereby doing juſtice, and eſchewing evil; the mode adopted was, that all thoſe Britiſh ſubjects who had property *out of the realm*, ſhould have repreſentatives where that property was (property and not perſons being the object of repreſentation) in conſtitutional legiſlatures of their own. This is, this has been, and ever was the mode of practice: it has been ſanctified by cuſtom, more than doubling that limitation of time, which eſtabliſhes cuſtom into the common law of the land: it is now wedded to the conſtitution, making part of that great principle of repreſentation, in which the very eſſence of the conſtitution conſiſts; and being ſo engendered into exiſtence, whilſt the conſtitution laſts, it muſt remain: but when injuſtice inſtead of juſtice ſhall reign, when the inſecurity inſtead of the ſecurity of property ſhall be the principle of government, then is the appeal to heaven; and *reſiſtance* becomes the law and the goſpel that is to determine the event.

This then is the ground upon which, confronting you, I have taken my ſtand. This is the plea of America againſt the *right*, or rather againſt the purpoſe-ſerving, anticonſtitutional *claim*, of Britiſh parliamentary taxation. This is the ſingle foe ſufficient in defence againſt thoſe many Titans of the ſtate, dignity, ſupremacy, legiſlative authority, omnipotence

omnipotence of parliament, unity of empire. This is my anſwer, new perhaps in *manner*, though old in *matter*, to the old ſtory over again of *real* and *virtual* repreſentation. This is the argument ſo forcibly put, and ſo unanſwerably maintained by Governor Johnſtone, in one of the fineſt parliamentary ſpeeches that ever was delivered upon any occaſion whatever.* This is the ſubject ſo concluſively handled by that incomparable writer, the author of the "Appeal to the juſtice and "intereſts of the people of Great-Britain;" and as what he there ſays is ſo much in ſo few words, I cannot but give you the quotation. "The ſecurity of property" ſays he, "as "Mr. Locke and common reaſon tell us, is "the great end of repreſentation. It is equal "enough when that is obtained. Now from "the participation of the elected and the elec-"tors with the non-electors in the taxes "which are impoſed, the latter, as I before "obſerved, have a virtual ſecurity, which is "equal to that of thoſe who do elect: but in "the caſe of the Americans there is no ſuch "participation, and conſequently no ſuch vir-"tual ſecurity; nay, on the contrary, as the "givers of the money of the Americans (ſup-"poſe them to be the Britiſh houſe of com-"mons) ſave their own property and that of their "conſtituents exactly in proportion to their "laviſhing that of the Americans, there is "a temp-

* See Almon's Parliamentary Regiſter, No. IV. p. 158.

" a temptation to extortion and extravagance,
" and therefore a virtual inſecurity of pro-
" perty, which is overturning the very foun-
" dation of government. If, for example, a
" tax is laid on Mancheſter, Birmingham,
" and Sheffield, the ſame is borne by Lon-
" don, Briſtol, and York; but let Boſton,
" New-York, and Philadelphia be taxed,
" will London, Briſtol, and York ſhare in
" the burthen of the impoſition? The real
" ſituation of the unrepreſented in England,
" and the people of America, if ſubject to the
" ſame power of taxation in the Britiſh par-
" liament, would be juſt as different as ſecu-
" rity and inſecurity, or right and wrong."
No words can more ſtrongly expreſs the diſ-
tinction, with the difference that there is, be-
twixt the *virtually* repreſented in Great-Bri-
tain, and the *virtually* repreſented in Ameri-
ca. The former, he tells us, are as effectually
repreſented in Great-Britain, as the *really* re-
preſented there are; and why? becauſe they
have the ſecurity of their not being more tax-
ed than the repreſentatives themſelves are;
and than this the *real* electors can have no
better ſecurity: but the latter not having
this, nor any other ſecurity whatſoever that
they might not be overburthened with taxes
by the Britiſh parliament; the neceſſity aroſe,
for juſtice ſake, for the ſake of the conſtitu-
tion, that they ſhould have repreſentatives of
their own where their property was, for the
ſecurity of that property, which is the great

end

end of repreſentation. But to illuſtrate this matter by a familiar inſtance. Methinks I ſhould have little fear of having my head broken, if the perſon who was to break it, was forced to break his own at the ſame time, and in the ſame degree too: but ſurely I ſhould have reaſon to fear, and therefore ſhould be very apt to hold up a ſtick in defence of myſelf, if the perſon who was to break my head, was to do it to ſave his own from being broken. What ſelf-intereſt on the one hand prevents the doing of, ſelf-intereſt on the other renders ſo neceſſary to be done, as nothing but ſelf-defence can effectually counter-act. This is the parallel exact between Great-Britain and America: for if Great-Britain taxed her own property *unavoidably* in taxing the property of America; America would have nothing to fear from the taxes of Great-Britain: but ſo far from this, the very reaſon given for onerating America with taxes is, that Great-Britain may be exonerated from them; and therefore the *cowardly* Americans, as they *have been bravely* repreſented to be, by the *bravadoes* of this country, as the *brave* reaſon, for levying war againſt them, in order to the levying of taxes upon them, are not only afraid of broken heads, but of being ſmitten on the right cheek; and then they muſt turn the left: and being ſtripped of their cloak, they may be told it is but *ſcriptural* to take the coat alſo. As to what may be ſaid, in reply to this, of faith in the

juſtice of parliaments for the ſecurity of property, I could wiſh there was more reaſon from experience for dependance thereon. The preſent parliament indeed, like the company preſent, of courſe is excepted: but there have been parliaments, as hiſtory will ſupport me in ſaying, and in time to come it may ſo happen again; in which, if the taxes they levied on the people had not come home to themſelves, a ſufficient degree of complaiſance might have been found, to have given and granted to the miniſter of the day, taxes, if called for, to the amount of twenty ſhillings in the pound. Under ſuch a parliament what would be the fate of America?

Upon this ſtate of the caſe then, and upon this alone, I would reſt the whole American queſtion: but to ſhew that the caſe is not barren of argument to ſupport it on every ſide, I will mention two points of which I do not know that any notice has as yet been taken; and at which I ſhall but barely hint, not only becauſe I am ſatisfied with what is already urged, but becauſe I know that on reaſon, which is the reſult of argument, the queſtion does not now reſt, nor has it ever depended.

The conſideration of the firſt point makes the following *poſtulatum* neceſſary, to wit; that no *free* ſtate, annexing another ſtate to its empire, can hold ſuch ſtate ſo made part of itſelf, under a form of government that is *not free*. To apply then this doctrine to the

Britiſh empire. The baſis of the Britiſh empire is the Engliſh conſtitution. The origin of the Engliſh conſtitution is compact, not implied, but expreſſed.* From compact ariſes certain primary, or fundamental laws, which form the conſtitution; and which are called, the principles of the conſtitution.† Theſe principles of the conſtitution eſtabliſh the government that follows from thence, and, for the execution of which, place the governing power in the hands of king, lords, and commons. The government is called a mixed government, or limited monarchy; and the governing power, the legiſlature, the parliament, or the three eſtates of the realm. Hence proceed laws as the *ultimatum*, or final cauſe of all.

From this chain of conſequences, or deduction of cauſes and effects, the following

* Lord Coke aſſerts and proves "that Magna Charta is "for the moſt part only declaratory of the principal grounds "of the fundamental laws and liberties of England;" for although *William* by killing *Harold* the uſurper, and routing his army, was ſtiled *the Conqueror*, yet he pretended a right to the kingdom, and was admitted by *compact*, and did take an oath to obſerve *the laws and cuſtoms*; which laws and cuſtoms were of Saxon original, and coeval with the firſt form of the conſtitution.

† Fundamental laws are, and ſhould be, as conciſe as poſſible; and are expreſſive of the mutual compact between the governors and governed, for the benefit of both. They are as *immoveable* points in a circle, whence all other decrees, acts of dyet, parliament, and aſſembly, flow. If theſe are preſerved entire, the reſpective ſocieties will thrive and flouriſh; if not, they will tend towards a diſſolution. See Philipps's Fundamental Laws, p. 8 of the pref.

corollaries naturally ariſe. That this governing power (ſo placed in the hands of king, lords, and commons, being *not* creative of itſelf, but created, in order to government, out of the conſtitution, by thoſe fundamental laws, which had their origin in compact) muſt be ſubordinate to the conſtitution; maintaining thoſe obligations of ſubordination that ſubſiſt between creature and Creator; and therefore can poſſeſs no powers of government diſtinct and ſeparate, greater, higher, or other, than the conſtitution itſelf conveys. That inaſmuch as this governing power of king, lords, and commons, has been ſaid to be omnipotent; ſo that which is omnipotent cannot be ſubordinate: but this governing power of king, lords, and commons is ſubordinate, and therefore it cannot be ſaid to be omnipotent. That ſo far indeed, it may be ſaid to be omnipotent, as the conſtitution itſelf is omnipotent: but the conſtitution itſelf is not omnipotent, becauſe it is ſubject to controul, by the higher power originally in, and ultimately reſiding with the people. That the people at large therefore, and not the conſtitution, nor the governing power reſulting therefrom, are omnipotent; if omnipotency can be predicated of any thing that is human: but to aſcribe omnipotency to mere potency only, is adding error to confuſion both in terms and ideas.* This being proved,

* Though the legiſlative be the ſupreme authority of the commonwealth, yet *it neither has, not ought to have* an arbitra-

ed, it appears, that the natural rights of mankind, ſo far as they are conſiſtent with the end of ſociety, which is the good of the whole, are protected by the fundamental laws of the Engliſh conſtitution; of which *freedom* is the corner-ſtone, ſupporting the three great pillars of the ſtate, perſonal ſecurity, perſonal liberty, and private property. Upon theſe pillars muſt all the laws lineally reſt, or collaterally have their bearings; if not, they are excentric, cauſing their own deſtruction, or threatning, till removed, the fall of the empire. For a law therefore to have the binding force of a law, it muſt be derived from the conſtitution, of which, *freedom* being the firſt principle, it follows; that *qualis eſt cauſa, talis eſt effectus:* but if it be not derived from the conſtitution, it can have no binding, nor any other force, than what the *ultima ratio regum* can give it; and even this, as experience teaches, is not *omnipotent.*

To theſe general concluſions ſome explanation may be neceſſary in addition. The king of Great Britain, although at the head of a free ſtate, may, in his own right, hold other ſtates under a form of government that is not free; as he does, for inſtance, the ſtates of the electorate of Hanover. He may too, even as king of Great-Britain, by virtue of his

ry power over the lives, liberties, or fortunes of the ſubjects; and, ſhould they manifeſtly appear to aim at ſuch an execrable deſign, the whole people may juſtly call them to an account. See Toland's Anglia libera, p. 4.

prero-

prerogative, and as generaliſſimo of the empire, hold a conquered ſtate (for the time being) under a form of government that is not free; that is, under military law: but in the inſtant that ſuch conquered ſtate is by treaty of peace, or otherwiſe, ceded to the crown of Great-Britain, (the crown of Great-Britain being one thing, and the king of Great-Britain, in ſome reſpects, another) in that inſtant it imbibes the ſpirit of the conſtitution, it is naturalized, it is aſſimilated to the government, it is governable, and to be governed by and under all thoſe powers with which the governing power of king, lords, and commons is inveſted by the conſtitution; but it is not governable, neither is it to be governed by any powers which the governing power of king, lords, and commons does not poſſeſs from the conſtitution; as, for example, it cannot be governed on the principles of ſlavery; becauſe the governing power of king, lords, and commons is appointed by the conſtitution to govern on the principles of liberty: which proves my poſtulate, that no *free* ſtate, annexing another ſtate to its empire, can hold ſuch ſtate, ſo made part of itſelf, under a form of government that is *not free*.

I am aware that what I have here advanced is directly in the teeth of that great commentator of the laws and conſtitution of England, Sir William Blackſtone. This able profeſſor, ſpeaking of Parliament, ſays, in his Comm. vol. i. p. 161. that, "it can regulate

"or

" or new model the ſucceſſion to the crown ;
" as was done in the reign of Henry VIII.
" and William III. It can alter the eſtabliſh-
" ed religion of the land; as was done in a
" variety of inſtances, in the reigns of Henry
" VIII. and his three children. It can change
" and create afreſh even the conſtitution of
" the kingdom, and of parliaments them-
" ſelves; as was done by the act of union,
" and the ſeveral ſtatutes for triennal and
" ſeptennial elections. It can, in ſhort, do
" every thing that is not naturally impoſſi-
" ble; and therefore ſome have not ſcrupled
" to call its power, by a figure rather too
" bold, the omnipotence of parliament. True
" it is, that what parliament doth, no autho-
" rity upon earth can undo." Such is the doctrine of this great authority of the law: but yet, however conſummate the authority, although, like the αὐτὸς ἔφη of Pythagoras, it be held infallible, if the doctrine be found contradictory to reaſon, I can only ſay with Horace;

Indignor, quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.

The learned judge tells us, that parliament can *regulate*, *new model*, *alter*, *change*, and *create afreſh*; and theſe are the particular powers which he aſcribes to parliament: but to *regulate*, to *new model*, and to *alter*, is *not to deſtroy*. The parliament *regulated* and *new modelled* the ſucceſſion to the crown; true: but it did not *deſtroy* the conſtitution in ſo doing: on the contrary, it acted upon that fundamental

fundamental law of the conſtitution, that the people have a right to pull down a *tyrant*, and to ſet up a *king*, with limited power, in his ſtead. It *altered* the eſtabliſhed religion of the land; ſo it did: but with the ſtricteſt conformity to the conſtitution: for by engrafting *religious* liberty upon *civil* liberty, the mind like the body became free. But it *changed* and *created afreſh* even the conſtitution of the kingdom, and of parliaments themſelves. This was much indeed! But how was this done? The learned judge tells you himſelf, for he adds, "as was done by "the act of union, and the ſeveral ſtatutes "for triennial and ſeptennial elections." But will the learned judge ſay, that there is any one right of the people in *magna charta* which the act of union oppugns? Is the *confirmatio chartarum*, the thirty-two corroborating ſtatutes from Ed. I. to Hen. IV. the petition of right, the *habeas-corpus* act, the bill of rights, the act of ſettlement, or any *one* of thoſe liberties therein mentioned, claimed, and declared to be the birth-right of the people of England *changed*, *created afreſh*, or *(whatever may happen)* as yet, in any inſtance, affected by the union? Does the alteration of triennial to ſeptennial elections deſtroy the fundamental right of the people to election and repreſentation, or ſubvert the conſtitution of parliaments themſelves? It would ſeem as if the learned judge had confounded the conſtitution of the kingdom, with the laws of parliament;

ament; between which there is an obvious difference. The public or political law of a country is one thing, the civil or municipal law thereof another. The conſtitution of England is this public or political law, the laws of parliament the civil or municipal law. The former is the foundation upon which the latter is the ſuperſtructure. The ſuperſtructure may be *regulated*, *new modelled*, *altered*, *changed*, or even *created afreſh* by parliament, whilſt the foundation remains fixed, and immoveable only by the people. During the commonwealth of England the conſtitution was in reality *changed* and *created afreſh*, though afterwards happily reſtored; but it was the people and not the parliament that did this: it was the democracy, the houſe of commons alone, who ſtiled themſelves the repreſentatives of the commonwealth, and voted that the kingly office and the houſe of lords ſhould be aboliſhed. Modes of ſubſtances may be entirely changed, whilſt the ſubſtances themſelves remain exactly the ſame. As language is the dreſs of thought, ſo are laws of parliament the dreſs of the conſtitution; both alike ſubject to change: but in both, the indentity of the one, and the idiom of the other, are preſerved. Juſt ſo has it been in the caſes cited above. By the act of union, and the ſeveral ſtatutes for triennial and ſeptennial elections, the parliament *altered* and *created afreſh*: but what did it *alter* and *create afreſh*? Not the conſtitution, but what it had

an undoubted right to *alter* and *create afreſh*; its own laws, its own ſtatutes, its own acts of parliament. To alter the letter of the conſtitution, by adapting it to thoſe occaſions which new circumſtances give birth to, and to preſerve the ſpirit of it entire, is the proper office of parliament, and the very buſineſs of laws. Under theſe modifications then of the *particular* powers of parliament, I entirely agree with the learned judge in the application of them; but in the *general* power which he aſcribes to parliament I muſt totally differ from him. "In ſhort," ſays he, "parliament can do every thing that is not impoſſible; and true it is, that what parliament can do, no authority upon earth can undo." Here I muſt preſume that the learned judge does not diſtinguiſh between *right* and *power:* for one may have the *power* of doing an act, without the *right* that ſhould accompany that *power.* As, for inſtance: I have the abſolute *power* of committing *ſuicide*, but ſurely I have not the *right* to be guilty of ſuch an offence againſt the firſt law of nature, *ſelf-preſervation.* I will admit that to preſcribe what and what only parliament can do, is to foreſee what is out of the reach of human foreſight; becauſe, laws, having regard to their firſt principles, may, in certain directions, branch out into endleſs variety: but to ſay what parliament cannot do, is within the compaſs of knowledge. I ſay, therefore, that if an act of parliament were

to

to paſs, declaring, that *perſonal ſecurity, perſonal liberty, and private property are not the rights of the people, and that the ſubjects of Great-Britain ſhall henceforward hold their lives, liberties, and properties, at the mere arbitrary will and pleaſure of the crown*; this I ſay parliament cannot do, though it is not "natu- "rally impoſſible" to paſs ſuch an act. It cannot do it upon the principle of right: becauſe ſuch an act would be deſtructive of itſelf, by ſubverting the firſt principles of the conſtitution; out of which the powers of enacting laws are derived from the people to parliament. It cannot do it upon the principle of power: becauſe the authority of the people, and this is "an authority upon earth," corrupt as they are, would *enforce* the repeal of ſuch an act; nor is the exertion of this authority of the people any thing unuſual: for, true it is, that popular clamour has oftentimes cauſed parliament to undo what it had done before, thereby making the boldneſs of that "rather too "bold figure," omnipotence, more conſpicuouſly to appear. Upon the whole, the learned judge has here, according to my ideas, miſtaken efficiency for cauſality, by making parliament to be the cauſe, inſtead of the efficient cauſe, of which the people are the firſt cauſe. I ſay the firſt cauſe, becauſe beyond the power of the people one cannot go; unleſs, as Pope ſays, "we look through nature "up to nature's God."

I was led to this manner of thinking, and of reaſoning upon the doctrine of Sir William Blackſtone, from hearing it aſſerted, and from having that aſſertion afterwards confirmed by the paſſing of the Quebec bill, namely; that "liberty was one thing in Eng- "land, but that liberty was another thing in "America." By this act, out of a *free* government, and a *limited* monarchy, is erected a government that is not *free*, and an *unlimited* monarchy; not only to the ſubverſion of the laws of the land, but, by the eſtabliſhment, inſtead of the toleration, of popery, to the ſuppreſſion of proteſtantiſm, and the religion of the church of England: the conſequence of which is, that the conſtitution now lies proſtrate on the ground, wounded, bleeding at heart, and hopeleſs, but in the reſiſtance of America for relief: for ſhould ſlavery and popery be the lot of America, there needs no oracle to predict what will be the fate of Great-Britain.

Having given a more ample diſcuſſion to this point than I, at firſt, had thoughts of doing, I ſhall now be the more conciſe on the ſecond point that follows; and which is this: that *commercial* colonization, as ſupported by hiſtorical authority, by fact, by reaſon, by the definition of the terms themſelves, excludes the very idea of taxation. Now were I to enter into the proofs of what is here aſſerted, I ſhould depart from my intended brevity on the ſubject; and therefore,

fore, conviction profiting nothing in practice, I ſhall leave what may be ſaid hereupon to the ſpeculations of the ſpeculative. It may be proper, however, juſt to obſerve that *commercial* colonization is a new ſpecies of colonizing, of modern date, and differing eſſentially from every other ſpecies of colonizing that is known. The compariſons therefore that have been drawn between the Grecian and Roman colonies, "from the days of Thu-"cydides down to the preſent time," have proceeded either from inattention to, or ignorance of, the ſubject. The excurſions of people to eaſe a country ſurcharged with inhabitants, gave riſe to the Grecian colonies: colonies planted among vanquiſhed nations to over-awe, and hold them in ſubjection, ſuch were the Roman colonies: but to the *colonies of commerce*, which the two laſt centuries have produced, it is laid down, and it is ſhewn, that *trade* is the *ſole* object and occaſion of them. When the colonies of Great Britain were eſtabliſhed in America, Great Britain never dreamed of having a *landed* intereſt in America; or any other intereſt than a *commercial* intereſt there: but let theſe bare hints ſuffice for my purpoſe.

I come now to obſerve, that, from a retroſpect of what has herein been ſaid, as well as from a general review of all your arguments, "for a total ſeparation of the colonies in "North America, from Great Britain" I ſhould have concluded; that hurt at the cenſure

ſure to which you had been expoſed, "of "your having dedicated too much of your "time to the ſtudy of commerce," you had purpoſely choſen this ſubject, and had publiſhed your tracts as convincing proofs to the world, how *little* you could have ſpent of your time in the ſtudy of commerce: I ſay I ſhould have drawn this concluſion neceſſarily, but that I perceived in you other motives lurking behind; which, although like the ſun under a cloud, or as the light that ſhineth in darkneſs, were yet viſible enough to me.

It is to be remembered that you object to every kind of accomodation with America; no union of any ſort will do: but ſalvation reſts on ſeparation, and on ſeparation only. Now let me ſee if, by groping in the dark, I ſhall not be able to bring to light your true reaſons for this propoſed event. I ſhall therefore, in order to this, make one or two ſhort extracts from your "*Humble Addreſs*;" and to them I ſhall add a few obſervations of my own. "They think" (that is the Whigs think) "that by cheriſhing and protecting a repub-"lican government in the colonies, they are "paving the way for introducing a ſimilar eſta-"bliſhment into Great-Britain. Therefore re-"publiciſm is the bond of union between "theſe unnatural Engliſhmen, and their fel-"low-labourers of America." "Indeed the "eſtates of the church, we all know, will fall "the firſt ſacrifice, ſhould the republican par-"ty now prevail." "The ſtate of parties

"among

" among us, and the growth of republican " principles all conſpire to prove, that we " ought to get rid of ſuch an onerous, *dange-* " *rous*, and expenſive connection as ſoon as " poſſible." Theſe are ſome among many other inuendos of yours that might be produced to the ſame effect: but theſe are enough for him that runs to read. As to myſelf I do not pretend to ſee farther than other people do: but looking only to the end of my noſe, I perceive, that the preſervation of *Toryiſm* in the *ſtate*, and a *monkiſh* jealouſy for the *hierarchy* of the *church*, are the two great weights that have ſet your whole machine in motion. We have been told by a worthy prelate, by a Whig biſhop, if I may have your pardon for caſting ſuch a reflection upon the cloth, " that " North America is the only great nurſery " for freemen upon the face of the earth." You yourſelf have knowledge enough to ſee that ſuch a country, poſſeſſed by freemen, is not to be enſlaved. Whilſt North America therefore remains united to this kingdom, Great-Britain with North America muſt be free. When the *high-flyers*, like *Icarus*, ſhall take their flight to the ſun; North America, by affording an aſylum to thoſe who are content to aſſociate with their fellow-creatures upon the earth, will be that ſun to melt their waxen wings, and hurl them to deſtruction. North America ſevered from Great-Britain, a *compactneſs* will be obtained, for this is one of your reaſons for ſeparation, which will effectually

tually produce the *ſtability* throughout the empire that you ſo ardently wiſh for. Furthermore: from North America being united with Great-Britain, an univerſal toleration in religion muſt continue. Every ſubject of the empire will have the liberty of chooſing his own path, and of going to heaven in his own way. If he cannot find it in the eaſt, he will look for it in the weſt; if it is not to be met with in the ſouth, he will ſeek it in the north: but no man that can walk, will be tied to the back of another, and if he refuſe, be perſecuted, for conſcience ſake, with fire and faggot. It is however, objected to the North Americans that they are enemies to *epiſcopacy*; and that they have no archbiſhopricks, biſhopricks, archdeaconries, rural deaneries, golden prebends, and ſuch like goodly things among them: but what do they anſwer? They ſay, that *epiſcopacy* is not eſſential to religion; and that this *eccleſiaſtical* diviſion of their country is but to ſerve a *ſecular* purpoſe. Whether they be right or not, is not for me to determine: but plain it is to me, that this is their *firſt* and *foremoſt* offence; an offence which has rouſed the endeavours of ſo many to convert the preſent *civil* into an *eccleſiaſtical* war, that had this been the age of holy wars, an American *cruſado* muſt inevitably have enſued. Hence ariſes your promiſed "letter to the diſ-"ſenting miniſters of North America." Hence, becauſe Mr. Locke has reſcued both the *church* and *ſtate* from ignorance and ſu-

perſtition, and placed them in the hands of common-ſenſe (out of which, I truſt, they will never eſcape) your threatened refutation of him. Great indeed is your deſign, but greater ſtill will be your ſucceſs. Refute Mr. Locke, turn common-ſenſe into metaphyſical nonſenſe, call down again from Heaven the vicegerency of the Lord, hold, by a *jure divino*, humanity in chains, tear up revolutional principles by the roots; and to theſe important ends let the ſeparation of America from Great-Britain (which "the "eſtates of the church, the ſtate of parties, "and the growth of republican principles" render ſo neceſſary) prove to be the happy means.

But it is now time that I take my leave; and which I do of you in all chriſtian charity. My only knowledge of you being through the medium of your writings, my ſentiments concerning you could have received no bias from perſonal diſreſpect, or private reſentment; and than this I have no further apology to offer in behalf of myſelf.

To the public too I am to bid adieu! and if a ſincere attachment to legal liberty, if a zeal running nearly into enthuſiaſm for the Engliſh conſtitution, if being a firm ſupporter of the Hanoverian ſucceſſion, a ſtrenuous advocate for the limited prerogative of the crown, a ſtrict defender of the juſt rights and privileges of both houſes of parliament, a profeſſed member of the eſtabliſhed church of England; I ſay, if theſe be acceptable of-

ferings to the public, I ſhall reſt in hope that the errors of my head, manifold as they will here appear to be, will be pardoned for ſuch the real feelings and dictates of my heart.

I am,

&c. &c.

Portman-Square,
Oct. 20, 1776.

P. S. The foregoing letter was deſigned to have been publiſhed many months ago: but upon calling to mind the queſtion, which, in a note of your "Humble Addreſs," you mention to have been put to you by the late Dr. Butler, biſhop of Briſtol; to wit, "Why "might not whole communities and pub-"lic bodies be ſeized with *fits of inſanity* "as well as individuals?" and conſidering that the then ſtate of this community was an abſolute and direct affirmative anſwer to this queſtion, I let drop my intention; in hopes, that the paroxyſm would be over, and that the people might return to their ſenſes: but now finding that, from that time to this, not one lucid interval has appeared, on the contrary, that inſanity every hour becomes more inſane, that even Bedlam itſelf is broken looſe, and the mad doctors are as mad as their patients; it remains, that, by an undiſguiſed repreſentation of the truth, and by endeavouring to diſcover the ſeat of this diſorder in the ſtate, remedies, with greater certainty, may be applied, and a cure, if not too late, more effectually eſtabliſhed. Hence then the now publication of the foregoing letter to you:

you: hence this poſtſcript, containing, within the limits of a poſtſcript, ſuch further notices as have occurred to me.

As in the very beginning of the preſent unnatural war againſt America, its end was, in my mind's eye, one of the firſt objects of contemplation; ſo here, leaving to others the practical conſideration thereof, a theoretical view of it has more immediately engaged my attention. I have looked up to its ſource. I have conſidered its principles, its reaſons, its motives, its object, its means, its end. I have traced its effects back to their cauſes, and between real and apparent cauſes have ſtudied to draw the line of diſtinction. I have thought, and I have exclaimed with Aſcanius in Virgil;

Quis furor iſte novus? quo nunc, quo tenditis, inquit,
Heu miſeræ cives! non hoſtem, inimicaque caſtra
Argivum; veſtras ſpes uritis.

I have ſaid, with the great Bolingbroke, where does all this *bottom?* And I have ſought for information. I have read the writings of the principal *ſtate argument-mongers*, and of their ſeveral opponents. I have liſtened to diſcourſe, and to ſpeeches; and although I found much cunning in ſome, and great wiſdom in others, I did not learn what I wanted to know. I have queſtioned, and I have aſked, upon what account is this American war entered into? By one of the firſt ſtate authorities I am told, that he has looked

into Montcalm's letters, and that he finds the occaſion of it there: that America means independency; and therefore the ſword of Great-Britain muſt be drawn, and the ſcabbard thrown away: that the Rubicon is paſt, before I could perceive the army to be in motion: and that, as a Swediſh general ſaid, in the reign of Guſtavus Adolphus, pointing to the enemy, "My lads, you ſee thoſe men "yonder, if you do not kill them, they will "kill you." Noble arguments of exhilaration, as well as of accelleration to the horrors of a civil war.* Another tells me, that if the accurſed ſtamp-act had never paſſed, this war had never been. A third ſays, that if the ſtamp-act had never been repealed, it would have executed itſelf; and quiet had ſucceeded. A fourth, that the declaratory-act is the ſole

* To theſe arguments of incitement to a civil war, the following pictureſque deſcription of the calamities attendant thereupon is a ſtriking contraſt. "The raſhly undertaking "of a civil war is of all wars moſtly to be avoided. Were "people to take a juſt view of theſe, they would not ſo rea-"dily as they often do, engage in them. Set before your "eyes the direful conſequences of thoſe wars; the laws "trampled on, juſtice diſregarded, violence every where pre-"vailing, your country covered with the dead bodies of your "fellow citizens, and flowing with ſtreams of blood running "from the veins of many thouſands of innocents; the fa-"ther fighting againſt the ſon, and the ſon againſt the fa-"ther; the wife betraying the huſband, and the huſband the "wife; infants at the breaſt left to the mercy of men void "of all mercy; virtue proſtituted, and licentiouſneſs riding "triumphant on the *ruins of liberty*; all theſe, and many "more, are the effects of civil wars, in which humanity in "general, is entirely caſt off, and all regard to ties of ac-"quaintance, friendſhip, or even blood, is ſet aſide."

bone

bone of contention. A fifth, that the Boſton port-act is the fountain from whence flow theſe torrents of blood. When I turn to your Tracts, thoſe treaſurres of political knowledge, there I find the origin of this war to be in the ceſſion of Canada to Great-Britain. But are theſe things really ſo? Or rather are they not "ſpringes to catch woodcocks?" Hoodwinks to keep ſhy horſes from ſtarting? Or ſtrait paths for men to walk in, like Balaam's aſs between two walls?

I have ſaid that the preſent war againſt America is the reſult of a plan founded in ſyſtem, and that the *landed* oppoſed to the *commercial* intereſt of the ſtate, are as the means in order to the end. To ſupport this aſſertion, if I ſhould produce all the proofs that the nature of the caſe will admit, it is all that can reaſonably be expected from me. In ſpeaking of the tranſactions of our own times, not yet committed to the records of hiſtory, much muſt be delivered upon the ſuppoſed knowledge of others; much addreſſed to their experience; much left to their judgments to decide; and more to their candour to excuſe, for the want perhaps of the moſt direct channels of information. Confining myſelf then to this ſingle enquiry, it may be neceſſary that I limit too the bounds of my enquiry; and therefore at the *æra of favouritiſm*, whoſe period ſtill reſts in the monſter-bearing womb of time, I ſhall here fix the date of the American war. This being done, I ſhall proceed

to

to take, politically, a view of the ſtate of parties at the demiſe of that beſt of monarchs, of that patriot King, George II. and then, after ſhewing what was the *Favourite*'s *idea of government* at this time, deduce from thence what further arguments I might have to offer on the ſubject.

At the period of demiſe mentioned, the ſtate of parties *in this country* was, many, many loyal Whigs, friends to the conſtitution, friends to the government, friends to liberty, friends to mankind; ſome Tories, and fewer Jacobites. *Out of this country*, the Scots; and the other members of the empire, make no neceſſary part of conſideration. This being, at this time, the ſtate of parties, the *idea of government* was (I ſpeak under favour of thoſe who know better than myſelf) "*a* "*coalition to take away all proſcription for* "*ever, from any ſet of men whatever; and to* "*aboliſh totally any diſtinctions, for the fu-* "*ture, of parties.*" From this *idea*, a maxim of ſtate was drawn, (let my judges be my witneſſes) *that our friends being already our friends, it was neceſſary to make friends of our enemies.* Of this maxim there is no need of elucidation. Every body knows that the Whigs, notwithſtanding the Tories joined with them to bring about the Revolution, have been the ſtanch ſupporters of the preſent family on the throne. The Tories and the Jacobites, no matter how many, no matter how few, Tories and Jacobites there have been, oppo-

ſers of, and enemies to, the preſent ſettlement. What was the diſpoſition of the Scots, let the years 1715 and 1745 declare. To make, therefore, in the language of Lord Bolingbroke, theſe "enemies to the conſtitution, "friends to the government," was now the buſineſs of thoſe whom it did concern; and as to effectuate this deſign was the *cauſa ſine qua non* of policy, ſo in what manner it was to be effected, will here progreſſively bring under my conſideration, the ſyſtem, the plan, the means, and the end which I have propoſed to treat of.

To enter minutely into the conſideration of that ſyſtem, by the powers of which the wheels of government have long ſince been made to move, would be only to repeat that of which every one is already but too well appriſed. Let it ſuffice then to obſerve here, that prerogative being put down at the Revolution but for the wholeſome purpoſes of government, and now no longer exiſting the handmaid of arbitrary power; the ſyſtem that was at that time deviſed, was at this to be purſued.* Shall I ſay the ſyſtem of corrup-

* "Though Richard II. and many others of our worſt "kings, down to Charles II. dabbled in corruption, it may "yet be ſaid, that the art of governing by regularly and ſy-"ſtematically bribing the houſe of commons came in at the "Revolution. It was firſt applied for buying off the Jaco-"bites, and has been going on ever ſince, till the ſitting "down of the preſent immaculate parliament, (the preſent "parliament is always immaculate) and has of late times "been applied to the buying off a ſet of troubleſome men, "who would otherwiſe have oppoſed the pious deſigns of "the court." See Political Diſquiſitions, vol. i. p. 399.

tion

tion in order to *legal* ſlavery, or, not to offend the delicate ears of the corrupted, ſhall I call it by the milder term of *influence*? And yet that which is ſo countenanced, ſo avowed, ſo boaſted of, ſo practiſed, can ſurely require no diſguiſe of it, either in word, or in deed. In ſhort, this was the ſyſtem; and therefore for the wiſe and good purpoſes "*of removing* "*all proſcription, of aboliſhing all party* "*diſtinctions, and of making our enemies to* "*be our friends,*" whilſt the loaves and fiſhes of the ſtate, under the maſk of œconomy, were to be broken, ſplit, and divided, into poſts, places, penſions, &c. &c. with riders riding upon them four or five deep, with reverſions in expectancy, and remainders almoſt without limitation; under the auſpices of favouritiſm, a diſtribution of them was to follow, among all the parties ſeverally, ſave and except the Whigs; who "being already our "friends," and needing no converſion, were to be left to feed on their loyalty; and as it was fitting that the *choſen people* ſhould be better taken care of than the reſt, America, like Canaan of old, became the *land of promiſe* to the Scots.†

Excel-

† Facts, ſo notorious as theſe are, need no evidence but their own. But to anticipate any call for proofs, I muſt, with reſpect to the diſpoſition of the offices of government in Great Britain, refer the reader to the annual Court Calendars, or *little red* books, which, in *black* letter, will give *great* inſight into inquiry. Let him ſee too the Public Advertiſer of the 19th of Auguſt laſt, wherein is publiſhed a liſt of the natives

Excellent arrangement! more excellent ſyſtem! But yet what ſhall avail a ſyſtem, if the means be found inſufficient to the end?

tives of Scotland who enjoy emoluments from this government, to the amount, as it is there ſtated, of one hundred thouſand pounds more than the annual receipt of the land-tax for the whole kingdom of Scotland, when rated at four ſhillings in the pound. As to America, information is not ſo eaſily had; the regiſters of places there being only viſible in the receſſes of office here: but, I think, I am warranted to ſay that of theſe places three fourths have been filled by the Scots; and as a proof in part of this, the following liſt of appointments at Jamaica is the extract of a letter to me from a friend of mine, reſident in that iſland; on whoſe veracity I can impicitly reſt: but ſhould the facts be otherwiſe than here repreſented, they are open to contradiction.

Governor	Scotchman.
His Secretary	Ditto.
Clerk of the court	Ditto.
Regiſter in chancery	Ditto.
Half the profits of the provoſt-marſhal's office	Ditto.
Receiver general	Ditto.
Naval officer	Ditto.
Comptroller	Ditto.
Fort Charles, 1200*l.* *per annum*, at preſent held by the lieutenant governor, but goes on the 1ſt of June to	Ditto.
Secretary of the iſland	Engliſhman.
Collector	Ditto.

N. B. "Many other ſubordinate appointments under "theſe, all Scotch. There is not in the civil, military, "or revenue eſtabliſhment, even a Creole of this coun-"try that enjoys any appointment of twenty pounds a year."

I muſt here take occaſion to add, that neither from the inſertion of the above, nor from any thing I have ſaid, or may hereafter ſay, do I mean *nationally* any reflection, or *perſonally* any offence. In giving this ſhort ſketch of the hiſtory of our own times, I have done ſo with this impreſſion on my mind, "*Ne quid falſi dicere audeat, ne quid veri dicere non audeat*," and to which if I have adhered in fact, as I have done in intention, I ſhall not fear (although truth has been adjudged a libel) the cenſure of any for whoſe good opinion I ſhould in the leaſt be ſolicitous.

King William uſed to ſay, " If I had places " enough, I would ſoon reconcile the two " parties :" but Lord Bolingbroke, long after him, remarks, " that the neceſſary ſupports of " ſuch means were not yet acquired;" and if they were not then acquired, they have not ſince been obtained: for although, by the payments of arrears, &c. the civil liſt has been conſiderably augmented, the other reſources of the revenue enlarged, the national debt trebled, all of which, not to mention the ſtate of the army and navy, is an increaſe of influence in the very ſame degree; yet, conſidering in how much the numbers of the *needy* are multiplied, and, by luxury having gone on more than *pari paſſu* with the means of corruption, that the neceſſities of individuals too are become ſo much the greater, it will be found, that the demands of venality have increaſed in a proportion greater than the ſupply. That this is an undoubted truth, I preſume, even the Dean of Gloceſter will not contradict: for had it been otherwiſe, that is to ſay, had the wages of ſin been adequate to the wants of the times, or could the miracle of the loaves and fiſhes have ever been performed again, the Engliſh conſtitution had long ſince not been what it now is. It has hitherto been preſerved by the want of the " neceſſary ſupports;" it will be deſtroyed whenever theſe " ſupports" are obtained.

Having ſaid this, it ſeems to follow of courſe, that, as to fulfil the *idea of govern-*

ment

ment of providing for all parties, except the Whigs, other ways and means muſt of neceſſity be found; ſo in America this pleaſing proſpect of reſource being ſeen, after turning the miniſter of the day * into the ſtalking-horſe

* It is worthy of note, that this miniſter of the day, after taking to himſelf the credit of being the author of the ſtamp-act, the direct object of which was bribery and corruption; when out of place, and in oppoſition, counteracted the court-ſyſtem of bribery and corruption, by procuring another act to paſs "for trying controverted elections." This act, I ſuppoſe, he intended, like charity, to cover a multitude of ſins; and indeed it had its effect; for it made him many friends. But without adverting to the inauſpicious hour of its birth, and looking upon it as the brat of oppoſition, I muſt profeſs to entertain ſentiments of it very different from the general opinion. It is true, the *freedom of election* ſeems to be in its views; and this, towards reformation is, to be ſure, a grand *deſideratum*: but at the ſame time it muſt be allowed, that the reformer began at the wrong end. By this act bribery and corruption are to be ſuppreſſed; but where? *without* doors: and why? for a monopoly *within*. Methinks "he ſhould have firſt caſt the beam out of his own eye, that he might have ſeen more clearly to pull out the mote that was in his brother's eye." If it had been a place or penſion act, or had it even gone, with the freedom of election, to a more equal repreſentation of the people, he might then well have ſaid with Othello,

"I've done the ſtate ſome ſervice, and they know't:"

but as it is, I may venture in the firſt place to aſſert, that no miniſter will ever looſe from it a queſtion in the houſe of commons; and in the next, that it is conceived too much in the ſpirit of ariſtocracy (which were the politics of this miniſter, whenever he was at liberty to have any principles of his own) to promiſe any good to the conſtitution. To me its operation is plainly that of excluding the *mercantile* intereſt from any ſhare in the legiſlature, and to throw all power into the hands of the *landed* property; than which there cannot be a more deciſive proof of the true intereſt of this country being groſly miſunderſtood: for landed men are not judges of trade, and trade (as it is ſomewhere moſt truly and emphatically ſtiled) is now "the key of the empire." When there was

horſe of the ſtate, American taxation became the adopted plan.

Such then being the ſyſtem, and ſuch the plan; the means in order to the end now remain for my conſideration. To carry this plan into execution, there were two things neceſſary to be brought about. The one was, a predilection for it in the *landed* intereſt of the nation; the other, that, being cloathed in the forms of the conſtitution, it might receive the ſanction of the legiſlature. The time was not yet ripe to avow, that American taxation was in order to Britiſh corruption. Something more *oſtenſible*, therefore, muſt be held up to public view; and "'tis true, 'tis pity, and pity 'tis, 'tis true," but true it is, that to make the bears dance to to the bagpipe's tune, the *leader's catch-word* was *Revenue*. Revenue! Sweet welcome ſound! but *revenue* too muſt be ſung to ſome tune; and the tune was, the *landed* intereſt labour under the heavy burthen of three ſhillings land-tax in the pound; the nation groans under the weight of 140 millions of debt; American taxation ſhall remove the former, and diſcharge the latter. To muſic ſuch as this is, what dancing bear could refuſe to dance! Muſic not only to

no other property in the kingdom but land, landed men were the only proper repreſentatives: but now that the nation is 140 millions in debt, and the landed men cannot even pay the intereſt of the money for which their lands are mortgaged, *without trade*, ſuch politics partake of phrenzy.

ſoothe

ſooth the ſavage breaſt, but feed the hungry appetite!

The *leader* led the dance; whilſt
To his ſilver ſounds, and golden meaſures,
The bears enlink'd, with one accord kept time,
And pace obedient.

Pardon, good Sir, the roughneſs of my metaphor. It is, I muſt own, like Shakeſpeare's ſimile of Lucentio's greyhound, "*ſomething curriſh*:" but it is rough only, as Ruſſian bears are rough; and as I knew your attachment to whatever proceeds from that country, I was induced thus to give a looſe to my imagination. I will, however, now return to thought leſs fanciful, and ſpeech more plain.

As the object of revenue, the proſpect of being diſburthened from the land-tax, and the hope of diſcharging the national debt, were arguments ſufficient for ſuch of the *landed* intereſt whoſe ideas reached not beyond the circle of their own acres; ſo it was neceſſary, for the perſuaſion of thoſe whoſe minds were more enlarged, not only to ſupport the meaſure by theſe arguments, but to ſet aſide the objections that might be raiſed to it.* Now the

* What is here ſaid of the landed intereſt is meant for thoſe who have been deceived by theſe pretences. If nobody has been impoſed upon by them, nobody is meant. I muſt add too, that there are many many gentlemen of this deſcription, whoſe underſtandings ſoar above the reach of impoſition, and whoſe liberal minds diſdain the ſacrifice of *public* good to *private* pelf.

Coloſ-

Coloſſean objection which ſeemed to ſtride over all the reſt, and to ſtare American taxation out of countenance, was; that commerce would be injured thereby: for what was taken out of the *one* hand by taxes, would certainly be loſt from the *other* in trade; and therefore it was better not to graſp at the ſhadow, leſt it prove in the end a loſs of the ſubſtance. But the anſwer was, that commerce was now grown into a hydra, whoſe heads, unleſs lopped off, would devour the great landed property of the kingdom: that the influence of the country gentleman was already deſtroyed thereby: that citizens, merchants, planters, nabobs, Americans, buy up their eſtates from them, turn them out of their patrimonial boroughs, live more luxurioufly than they do, and, to give you back your own words, Mr. Dean, "it is the *trading* and not the *landed* "intereſt which ſets up moſt new carriages." This was the pathetic ſtrain of deceitful oratory; and thus, with the rich proſpect of being exonerated from taxes, of diſcharging the national debt, and of rolling in American revenue, was a ſpirit of envy and jealouſy, as the wanted means of executing the adopted plan of American taxation, rouſed in the breaſts of the *landed* againſt the *commercial* intereſt of the ſtate.

I come now to obſerve, that although all ſhould agree with me in the premiſes that I have here laid down, yet, I am ſenſible, there are many who, not having been led to think

of theſe matters in the manner I have done, may, at firſt ſight, and with great reaſon too, differ from me in ſome of my concluſions. It may be ſaid, how is it poſſible to think that the *landed* intereſt could be brought to oppoſe the progreſs of commerce in this country! Do not the value of their lands, the rentals of their eſtates, their credit in every particular as individuals, and their very being as a people, depend upon commerce? And how then can one infer ſo unnatural a bias in them, and ſuch a diſpoſition to ſelf-injury? The argument, I confeſs, is good in all its points; and its truth incontrovertible: but even truth and argument to experience, that beſt miſtreſs of wiſdom, muſt ſubmit. That the politics of this country have been levelled againſt its trade is proved to demonſtration by the effects of the meaſures purſued.——It is proved by the meaſures themſelves. When the American war was entered into, there was every reaſon to believe, there was no *one* reaſon to ſuppoſe to the contrary, but that the manufactures of this country, its internal trade, its external commerce, at leaſt the moſt valuable part of them, would be cruſhed in the conteſt; and yet the American war was entered into. That this has not happened, is owing to accident; for on accidental occurrences, trade has ever ſince ſubſiſted: occurrences that may never happen again, and cannot now laſt.

Acts

Acts of parliament have paſſed intentionally injurious and expreſly deſtructive of commerce: as of which the act "for prohibiting "all trade and intercourſe with America" is a woeful inſtance. By this act, the important trade of the Weſt-Indies, nay, the very annihilation of the people themſelves, were ſet at the hazard of a die: but to be leſs minute, (confined as I am to the limits of a poſtſcript) the very principle of American taxation itſelf, is an actual declaration of war upon American commerce, and its exerciſe the total overthrow of it. "It is an allow-"ed maxim," ſays the very judicious Mr. Wood, in his Survey of Trade, "*that* "*induſtry has its firſt foundation in liberty*; "and it is certain that they who are either "*ſlaves*, or perceive their *freedom precarious*, "can neither ſucceed in *trade* nor *meliorate* "a country." Of this doctrine there needs no application. If this author be right, the authors of American *ſubjugation* muſt be wrong. But further: this author not only ſupports this doctrine upon the principles of reaſon, but applies it to the very caſe before us; for he goes on to write thus: "I will "not pretend to determine, for or againſt "the opinions I have ſeen of our great law-"yers, whether the *people* in our *colonies* and "*plantations* have the right to *all* the privile-"ges of *Britiſh ſubjects*: but the contrary "notion is *too much encouraged*, upon which "account it will, peradventure, be a great "ſecurity

" ſecurity and encouragement to the *induſtri-*
" *ous people* in *that part* of the world, if *a*
" *declaratory law* were made, that *Britons*
" have a right to *all the laws of Great-Bri-*
" *tain*, for the ſecurity of the ſubject, while
" they remain in the countries under the domi-
" nion of this kingdom." How contrary this ſyſtem of colony government, to the plan of adminiſtration purſued! How different this *declaratory law*, to the *declaratory act* paſſed.* One would think that this excellent writer on trade, as he is juſtly eſteemed to be, foreſaw the politics of the preſent times, and, in prophetic ſpirit, wrote for our inſtruction: but the truth is, he lived in days ſimilar to our own. He lived when the *Tory miniſtry*, in the latter years of queen Anne, made trade the object of their deſtruction; and as now, oppoſed the *landed* to the *commercial* intereſt of the ſtate. His account of this buſineſs is ſo pointedly to the purpoſe, that I cannot omit the mention of it. After ſhewing the ſacrifice that was made of the trade to the houſe of Bourbon, he proceeds to tell us, " that this was not the only
" crime in reſpect of trade, the *then miniſtry*

* However unconſtitutional the principles of the *declaratory act* may be, I muſt here ſay, that, looking upon it in the ſame light that the Americans did, I conceived it to be no more than an act of *accommodation*, if I may ſo ſpeak, politically preſerving, on the one hand, the honour of this country in *declaring* its ſuppoſed right of taxation, whilſt, on the other, the right was done away in the repeal of the ſtamp-act; and that it was never intended, as it has been ſince made, by the Machiavelian politics of an *efficient cabinet*, the baſis of future ruin to the colonies.

" were guilty of, which they ſacrificed in " every part, as far as was in their power; " and likewiſe endeavoured to create a diffe- " rence between the *landed and trading inte- " reſt*, as the merchants and other traders of " the city of London take notice of in their " addreſs to his majeſty upon the late rebel- " lion, then on foot in England and Scot- " land, in theſe words;"——" The endea- " vours of thoſe who laid plans *of ruin and " ſlavery* for theſe kingdoms, have been not " only to divide our religious from our civil " intereſts, but to ſet one part of the *property* " againſt *another*, by making the *landed* gen- " tleman *jealous* of the trader, as if the inte- " reſts were incompatible: they could not " have contrived a more effectual method to " deſtroy their country, than by *diſcounte- " nancing* trade, a conſiderable ſource of its " ſtrength and power. This was the proper " buſineſs of men who deſigned to give up a " rich and flouriſhing nation." Theſe were the politics of *thoſe* days: how far they cor- reſpond with the politics of *theſe*, I ſhall leave to the *commercial* intereſt at large, and again to the city of London, when, in the fulneſs of time, the compariſon ſhall be found expedi- ent. In the interim, information is open to all; and facts, I too much fear, will not be wanting to ſupply conviction: but as facts are ſometimes known without due regard being paid to the motives from whence they ſprung, it may not be impertinent here to remark; that

trade

trade produces wealth, wealth begets independence, independence protects liberty. Theſe are the reaſons for which trade is conſidered in France, and in *all* other countries that are enſlaved, not to be the profeſſion of a gentleman; and, under this diſcouragement, is confined to the loweſt claſs of people, from whoſe riches, for want of *family connections*, and *perſonal* ſupport, the danger of independence is not apprehended. The ſame reaſons will always operate in the ſame manner, whenever the ſame concurrence of circumſtances exiſts.

Another ground upon which my concluſions may in part be diſputed is, that however impoſed upon the *landed* intereſt in general might have been, parliaments will take care, *ne quid detrementi capiat res publica*. That the preſent parliament will do this, it is, to be ſure, our duty to hope and expect; beſides it is but fair that their term ſhould expire before judgment be paſſed on their conduct: for as the ſeventh year of their political exiſtence may rectify all the errors (if any there ſhould be) of the preceding ſix, ſo when the time ſhall come, I truſt they will then be able to ſay with the church; "I have fought a good "fight, I have finiſhed my courſe." But with other parliaments that have lived, and are now dead, the caſe is otherwiſe. Their time of probation is at an end, and their merits or demerits are already brought to the focus of every eye. A very worthy ſenator, Colonel Barré, who died with the laſt parli-

ament, but who is again come to life in this, has from the *dead* brought this evidence to the *living*. "The late parliament," ſays he, "began their political life with a violation of "the ſacred right of election, in the caſe of "Middleſex; they died in the act of popery, "when they *eſtabliſhed* the Roman-catholic "religion in Canada, and they have left a re-"bellion in America as a legacy." If we carry our eyes back to the parliament preceding the late parliament, we ſhall find as little reaſon for eulogy there: but where is the ſurpriſe of this, if we advert to the cauſe? The author of that moſt valuable compilation, entitled "Political Diſquiſitions," upon this ſubject, expreſſes himſelf in this manner; "Nothing," ſays he, "can be imagined more "impudent than the attempt of ſome among "us, to lull our jealouſy, which needs all the "eyes of Argus, aſleep, by telling us, it is "impoſſible, that eight hundred lords and "commons ſhould ever take part with the "enemies of their country *or its liberties*. "Do we not know, that in the four laſt years "of queen Anne's reign, a majority in the "houſe of commons, and a very great num-"ber in the other, were in the intereſt of "France and the Pretender, and that if that "ill-adviſed princeſs had not dropped at the "time ſhe did, the nation was in the utmoſt "danger of being ſacrificed. The majority "of the commons, A. D. 1709, were Whigs; "in the laſt four years they were Tories.

"Such is the influence of the court over the "commons. For the court interpoſes both "in the elections of members, and in their "votes in the houſe." Vol. i. page 370. Now the reaſon of this, is; all men are naturally fond of power (though few know how to uſe it) and this fondneſs is by ſome carried ſo far, that they readily ſubmit to be ſlaves themſelves, in order to become tyrants over others. With a corrupt parliament this is juſt the caſe. The corrupted members of it are as great ſlaves as any where exiſt, and their ſlavery of the worſt kind; for thoſe ſlaves who know not the difference between freedom and ſlavery are ſatisfied with their condition of ſlavery: but the lives of theſe hirelings are one continued ſcene of thinking, and of acting, by the influence of others, in oppoſition to their own feelings, againſt the dictates of nature, and under the reproaches of conſcience. Their conſolation however is, that although enſlaved themſelves, they are the inſtruments of tyranny over others; and this together with the feeding of their vanity or their avarice, by the *entitling* of ſome who were *titleleſs* before, and by putting money into the purſes of others, whilſt it deſtroys all motives to virtuous action, it turns what was meant as an impenetrable phalanx of defence for the liberties of the people, into the moſt formidable attack upon them. From theſe and ſuch like conſiderations therefore, it perhaps may appear that my concluſions

on

on this head too will bear the teſt both of reaſon, as well as experience; and as from corrupted parliaments we have the worſt of all tyranny to dread, the tyranny of numbers, ſo it is the duty of every freeman of the empire to oppoſe, as much as in him *lawfully* lies, ſuch meaſures as obviouſly lead to the means of ſuch corruption.

Having thus, by the moſt concluſive evidence, removed the doubts that might have ariſen in the minds of ſome, of the poſſibility of the *landed* intereſt aiming at the ſuppreſſion of commerce, and of parliaments co-operating with them to that end; I may be further called upon, and aſked, how does it appear that *revenue*, for the purpoſe of leſſening the burthens of the nation, was not the real object of American taxation, but was made the *catch-word*, or *ignis fatuus* only, to deceive and miſlead the good ſort of people of this country? To this my reply is, that it ſo appears by the moſt ſatisfactory and convincing proofs; ſo ſatisfactory and convincing, that the *landed* intereſt begin to perceive it themſelves: for inſtead of taking off from the land-tax, a ſhilling in the pound here, (by way of beginning) and clapping it on America; an additional ſhilling in the pound has been clapped upon them: that inſtead of paying off ten millions of the national debt here out of America, (by way of beginning) twenty millions more are added to the account; and that now plunged up to the ears

in

in difficulties, (beſides expence) flouncing, floundering, and ſtill getting deeper, they are already reduced to the miſerable ſituation of not being able to get forward a ſingle inch, nor eke to retreat a pace. But it may be ſaid, that this is no direct anſwer to the queſtion: for that which has happened, ariſing out of the firmneſs of American reſiſtance, and from the adverſe fate of war, no one could foreſee the event; and therefore the queſtion is, was *revenue* really, *ab initio*, the object of American taxation, or not? This is really the queſtion; and therefore giving an anſwer to it in the ſhort word *not*, I ſhall proceed to prove that this anſwer is the truth.

If corruption was, at the time I am ſpeaking of, the ſyſtem of government, as I have ſhewn, and which nothing but the effrontery of falſhood can counterſay; is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe that any meaſures could have been adopted to leſſen that influence by which government was to have been carried on? If the raiſing a *revenue* in America was with a view to decreaſe the means of corruption in England, this was not forwarding the buſineſs at all; it was only the robbing of Peter for the payment of Paul, when Peter and Paul, according to *the idea of government*, were both to be paid. If the national debt was a ſource of national corruption, by which government was to be ſupported; who is the miniſter that would wiſh for the diſcharge of the national debt? If the collecting of the land-

tax

tax in England, beſides the large ſums it produces, was another ſource of corruption; what miniſter would part with the tax-gatherers? But ſuppoſing that a *revenue* had been to have been raiſed in America, and for the uſe of this country too; will any man, with two ſimple ideas only in his head, ſay, that ſuch revenue ſo raiſed there, would have been applied to the taking off of any one ſingle tax that had been impoſed here? I ſhould fancy no ſuch perſon could be found: for every body muſt know, that taxing and funding now-a-days ſo aſſuredly follow one another, that taxes once levied cannot be releaſed.

But from reaſoning on ſuppoſition, let us now ſee what the matter of fact is. I ſay then it was known, of a certainty, from the very beginning of the plan of American taxation, that *revenue*, for the uſe of this country, could not be procured out of that; and in ſaying this, I am ſupported by the moſt undoubted authority. The authority I allude to, in the firſt inſtance, is the authority of one of the greateſt enemies to America; and therefore to be depended upon: though he prove too one of the *worſt* friends this country ever had. It is that of Governor Bernard, in a letter of his to Lord Hillſborough, ſhewing the inability of the Americans *to bear drawing money from them*, as he himſelf expreſſes it. The letter is this; "I "can readily recommend that part of the "petition, which prays relief againſt thoſe acts

"which

" which are made for the purpoſe of drawing " a *revenue* from the colonies; for they are " ſo little able to bear drawing money from " them, that they are unable at preſent to " pay the charges of their ſupport and pro- " tection." Now if this be the opinion of Governor Bernard, who was reſident on the ſpot, and one of the firſt movers in this unhallowed buſineſs; can any one imagine that the miniſter did not know that a revenue could not be had from America? It may be ſaid, indeed, that this was matter of opinion only in Governor Bernard; and therefore upon trial it might have been found otherwiſe. Let us ſee then what experience has taught. The ſtamp-act paſſed: how much money was raiſed by it? The enormous ſum of eighty pounds; as, I am told, the great Earl of Chatham aſſerted in the houſe of lords: but no matter for the exact ſum, whatever it did raiſe, was that an object of revenue? No. Why then perſiſt in taxation? For the very reaſon that the ſtamp-act paſſed. And this will lead me, from ſhewing what the means of American taxation were, to the end deſigned by it.

It has appeared that revenue was not the object of American taxation, for it could not be procured; which is reaſon enough: but, indeed, I have gone leſs into the proof of this, becauſe every fool is now wiſe enough to know that it was *never* intended. The payment of the national debt could not have

been meant, becauſe that would have been, as I have ſaid before, a counteracting of the ſyſtem, by leſſening the means of corruption; and the ſame reaſon holds good for not diſcharging the *landed* gentry of their three ſhillings land-tax in the pound. But if neither revenue, nor payment of the national debt, nor even getting rid of the land-tax was meant, what was intended? The very thing that the ſtamp-act intended, and produced; which was not revenue: for the net proceeds of this tax were eighty pounds only, and this could neither help the payment of the national debt, nor ſupply the deficiency of the land-tax; beſides what was to have been raiſed by this tax, was, in merciful kindneſs to America, to have been expended there: but how expended there? Moſt ſyſtematically. In what reſpect? In making King's friends; in providing for thoſe who were to have been provided for by King's friends; in filling up the *idea of government.* But how does this appear? By the ſame unqueſtionable proof of the ſtamp-act. It appears, by the number of tax-gatherers, or ſtamp-officers, that, under this act, were, by other ſtamp-officers here, to be appointed for the colonies; and who accordingly went over to the Weſt-Indies and America, in ſhoals, like fiſhes in ſearch of their prey: or, as bees in ſwarms to ſuck,

" The honey dew on Hybla's flow'ry banks;"

" *Cecropias innatus apes amor urget habendi*
Munere quamque ſuo :"

until the frightful coats of tar and feathers diſperſed, and drove them back to the empty cells of their own northern hives. And this was the end propoſed by American taxation; an end, however, which I ſhould have been happy to have found had finiſhed what I had to ſay on this ſubject: but this end was not to terminate here. In it was conceived an event " big with the fate of Cato and of " Rome :" an event, no other than the loſs of Britiſh liberty, and the downfall of the Engliſh conſtitution. And when I ſay this, I am ſorry to find myſelf ſo ſupported, both by reaſon and by truth; for I would wiſh to know that the Engliſh conſtitution was proof againſt all attempts to its injury under the ſun; even the attempts of the *Pretender himſelf*, when aided by his oldeſt, moſt faithful, and moſt zealous friends and relations. But ſhould a miniſter in this country have it in his power to alter the charters of America, and in conſequence thereof, to appoint governors, lieutenant governors, chief juſtices, judges of the admiralty and common-law courts, attorney and ſolicitor-generals, in ſhort, to officer all the appointments he ſhall chooſe to inſtitute in the ſeveral civil departments there, including the legions of tax-gatherers neceſſary both for *internal* and *external* taxation; to ſtation fleets on the coaſt, to keep up ſtanding armies in every province, to build forts on

their rivers and lakes, and to garriſon them, as in aid of the civil power muſt neceſſarily be done; and withal for the maintenance and ſupport of theſe meaſures, to tax and raiſe a revenue in America by Britiſh acts of parliament: I ſay, America, under this military government (and which was intended for it) would become ſuch a *ſinking fund* of corruption, that no barriers nor dikes, however ſtrong, that this country could erect, would be ſufficient to prevent a general inundation of ſlavery over all the Britiſh empire; and of this even you, as I muſt do you the juſtice to acknowledge, are ſo ſenſible of, that in alledging your motives for a ſeparation of the colonies from Great Britain, and looking upon theſe meaſures as the natural conſequence of American ſubjection, you ſay in one of your tracts; "I humbly ſubmit it to be "duly weighed and conſidered, what a bane-"ful influence this *governement à la Pruſſe* "would have on every other part of the Bri-"tiſh empire. England free, and America "in chains! And how ſoon would the en-"ſlaved part of the conſtitution, and per-"haps the greater, contaminate the free and "the leſſer!"

But America has reſiſted. Conqueſt therefore is to effect what cunning could not obtain; and confiſcations and forfeitures are to make good the loſs of taxation to thoſe, who, by forfeitures and confiſcations, have heretofore been ſufferers themſelves. Until, however, I

ſhall

ſhall ſee this with my eyes, and hear it with my ears, I muſt live in the hope; that the time may ſtill come, when a temple of *Concord* ſhall be erected on *Conſtitution-hill*, (which place for its neighbourhood, as well as its name, I ſet apart) within which, whilſt Britannia ſhall hold the *cup* in the one hand, and the *cornucopia* in the other, without, ſhall, in golden letters, be the following inſcription:

America conquered in Germany,
Britiſh liberty ſaved in America;
Immediately in the former,
Mediately in the latter,
Earl Chatham, author of both.

To this hope of returning union to the now disjointed parts of the Britiſh empire, nothing more deſirable can be added; and, therefore, after preſuming that I have fulfilled my deſign, in ſhewing, that the preſent war againſt America is not the effect of the cauſes aſſigned by you and others, but of a fixed plan of adminiſtration founded in ſyſtem, the *landed* oppoſed to the *commercial* intereſt of the ſtate, being as the means, in order to the end, I ſhall conclude this *long* poſtſcript with this *ſhort* wiſh, in the fervency even of prayer.

May the authors, whoever they may be, of this Machiavelianiſm, or art of ruling tyrannically over a free people, like Machiavel, ſtarve in a gaol.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 8. line 6. for *phamplet* read pamphlet.
23. 26. for *conſeience* read conſcience.
29. 12. dele put.
63. 23. for *port-tax* read poſt-tax
73. 28. for *virtaul* read virtual.

NEW BOOKS, Printed for J. ALMON.

A LETTER from Governor Pownall to Adam Smith, LLD. and FRS. Being an Examination of ſeveral Points of Doctrine laid down in his Inquiry into the Nature and Cauſes of the Wealth of Nations. 4to. 1s. 6d.

The Letters of VALENS; with a Preface and Corrections by the Author. 3s.

The Hiſtory of New-York, from the firſt Diſcovery. With a Deſcription of the Country, an Account of the Inhabitants, their Trade, Religious and Political State, &c. by W. Smith, A. M. 8vo. 5s. boards, 6s. bound.

The PARLIAMENTARY REGISTER, containing an Account of the moſt intereſting Speeches and Motions, accurate Copies of all material Papers and Letters, important Evidence, Petitions, Bills, Proteſts, &c, &c. in both Houſes of Parliament, during the years 1774, 1775, and 1776. Five Volumes, half bound, 1l. 10s. 6d. and bound, 1l. 13s.

Take your Choice! Repreſentation and Reſpect; Impoſition and Contempt. Annual Parliaments and Liberty; long Parliaments and Slavery. With an Emblematical Frontiſpiece, 1s. 6d.

An Aſylum for Fugitives. Price One Shilling each Number. (Publiſhed every three Months) Three Numbers make a Volume. The firſt Volume is juſt finiſhed, and may be had ſewed 3s. or bound 3s. 6d.

The

NEW BOOKS Printed for J. ALMON.

The REMEMBRANCER; or, Impartial Repoſitory of Public Events. Publiſhed Monthly. 1s. each Number.

This Work began in June 1775, with the Commencement of Hoſtilities at Lexington in New-England, and has been continued Monthly to the preſent Time; containing from Time to Time, the Accounts, as given by both Sides, of every Public Tranſaction; with the ſeveral Journals, Reſolutions, Declarations, &c. preſerving a great Number of uſeful Papers not any where elſe to be met with.

Seventeen Numbers have been publiſhed, which makes three Volumes; to each Volume is a copious Index, the whole half bound and lettered, 18s. 6d.

Select Tracts on American Affairs, from the Beginning of the Year 1768 to the End of 1775. In four Volumes, Octavo; half bound and lettered, 1l. 1s.

Journal of the American Congreſs for 1775. 3s.

The INTERIOR Country of North America, from Montreal to New York, which is become the Theatre of War, between the King's Troops and the Americans, is faithfully and accurately delineated in Governor Pownall's Map of the Middle Provinces. In this Map, all the Rivers, Falls, Lakes, Iſlands, Creeks, Towns, Forts, Hills, &c. are to be found, with their reſpective Names; ſo that the Routs of the ſeveral Armies, their occaſional Poſts, &c. may be traced with the greateſt Eaſe and Exactneſs. This Map, having been collated and examined with the Surveys now lying at the Board of Trade, may be depended upon for Authenticity. It is further rendered uſeful, by a curious and copious topographical Deſcription of the Country. Price 10s. 6d.

A Companion to the Royal Kalendar; being a compleat Liſt of all the Changes made in Adminiſtration, from the Aceeſſion of the preſent King, to the preſent Time; with the late and preſent Parliaments; all the Alterations occaſionally made in both; the Right of Election in each Place; in whoſe Favour Conteſts have been decided; the Names of the Canditates, Number of Voters, &c. Price 1s.

The

NEW BOOKS Printed for J. ALMON.

The Royal Kalendar, publiſhed annually. Containing the authentic Liſts of all the public Offices, correct Liſts of both Houſes of Parliament, including all the New Creations, the laſt Alterations in every Department, &c. Price 2s. bound in red; 2s. 6d. with an Almanack; 3s. with the Companion; and quite complete with Companion and Almanack, 3s. 6d.

The Arms, Supporters, Creſts and Mottoes of the Peers, Peereſſes and Sees of Great Britain and Ireland: with the Baronets of England; all continued to November, 1776.

A Collection of all the Treaties of Peace, Commerce, and Alliance, between Great Britain and other Powers, from the Revolution (in 1688) to the preſent Time. Two Volumes. 12s.

No Pains have been ſpared to make this Work complete. Whenever Treaties have been publiſhed by Authority, or laid before Parliament, theſe Copies only have been followed; and whenever no Tranſlation by Authority has appeared, the Original is inſerted, together with a Tranſlation.

A Collection of Intereſting Political Tracts from 1764, to the End 1773. Eight Volumes 2l. 2s.

A collection of Intereſting Letters from the public Papers, particularly including thoſe written on the ſeveral Changes of Adminiſtration, the Taxation of the colonies, &c. from the Acceſſion of the preſent King to the of End of 1768. Two Volumes, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*** It is an Obſervation in Kennet's Regiſter, which Lord Sommers has choſen for his Motto, to his Collection of Tracts, "That the Bent and Genius of the Age is beſt known in a free Country, by the Pamphlets and Papers which daily come out."